

231.7 J761 (2)

Jones

\$2.50

Is the Kingdom of
realism?

231.7 J761 (2)

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

$$284 + 16 = 300$$

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY

LIBRARY
CITY

MA

MAY 9 '40

SEP 8

SEP 24 X 13

8:00 - 132

1017

JAN 21 '53

(1335)

JAN 21 '53

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM

BOOKS BY E. STANLEY JONES

ABUNDANT LIVING
IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?
ALONG THE INDIAN ROAD
THE CHOICE BEFORE US
VICTORIOUS LIVING
CHRIST'S ALTERNATIVE TO COMMUNISM
CHRIST AND HUMAN SUFFERING
THE CHRIST OF THE MOUNT
THE CHRIST OF EVERY ROAD
CHRIST AT THE ROUND TABLE
THE CHRIST OF THE INDIAN ROAD

IS THE
KINGDOM OF GOD
REALISM?

By
E. STANLEY JONES

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

NEW YORK • NASHVILLE

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Copyright, MCMXL

By WHITMORE & STONE

All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publishers, except brief quotations used in connection with reviews in a magazine or newspaper.

FOREWORD

SOMEONE HAS CYNICALLY REMARKED THAT IF YOU DO not believe in the depravity of man, then look in the dictionary and see how words, becoming associated with man, are degraded by that contact. This is not fair, of course, for many words coming from a very lowly origin are lifted by contact with man; higher meanings are put into them.

But the word realism has suffered degradation in recent contacts with man. We speak of "the realism" of Clemenceau, the Tiger, reading hate and revenge into the Versailles Treaty; of "the realism" of the risque novel; of "the realism" of the debunking biographies; of "the realism" of a great deal of modern psychology, which is described in the words of one of the truly sound and able ones, Doctor Link: "Here we find a collection of speculative and pseudoscientific theories which have already helped to undermine the morals and thinking of a civilization."

Obviously, the word "realism" needs redemption. For if it means "according to reality," then it should be one of the grandest words in our vocabulary. Particularly so to the Christian who believes that Reality has meaning, purpose, goodness at its heart. For if "grace and reality are ours through Jesus Christ" (Moffatt) then "grace and reality" are connected, so that reality not only has meaning, purpose, and goodness at its heart—it has redemption at its heart.

But I am not particularly interested in this book with the ordinary meanings of the word "realism;" I am more than interested in the central skepticism of the day: Is the Kingdom of God realism? Will it work? Or is it a beautiful, but impractical idea which breaks its delicate wings upon the hard facts of real life? It may work in another and different world, but will it

...FOREWORD

work in this hard workaday world of ours? Is it an unnatural imposition upon the ordinary framework of humanity? an attempt to give human nature a bent for which it is not made? Is the Kingdom of God the ground plan of the universe, so that if you do not build upon it, then the house of human living topples into ruin here and now, or is the Kingdom of God an idea which might decorate and adorn the roof of life, but would not be missed if left off? Dante says: "Thy will is our peace"—but is the will of God also our plan, the way we are made to work? Are the laws that underlie the Sacred Scriptures the laws that underlie our being? Has God stamped any laws in our being, in our nerves and in our tissues, and are they the same laws that Jesus was uncovering when He spoke on Judean hillsides? Is the truly Christian man the unnatural man, the eccentric, the queer? Or is he the man who has caught the way to live, therefore a harmonized, rhythmical, effective man? And are the laws of sociological living, as far as we have been able to discover them in our half-lights, turning out to be the very laws of the Kingdom of God? If we had a truly Christian society, would it be a good society—the best society? Can you compartmentalize Christianity in churches on Sunday, and then run our economic and social and international life the rest of the time on pagan principles without coming to just the kind of a mess we are now in? Can you violate the law of love, any more than the law of gravity, without getting hurt? Can you run society on hate and fear and selfishness and dishonesty without its breaking down? Is evil a parasite on the good—does it have to throw around itself enough of love, of confidence, of unselfishness, of honesty to keep itself going, and would it sink without these lifebuoys which it borrows? Will the universe back evil? Does evil end in self-stultification? in self-frustration? Is it suicide? On the other hand, when we find the Kingdom of God, do we find ourselves? Are we freest when most bound by its laws? When we find the Kingdom of God, do we find Life?

FOREWORD

That the answers to these burning questions are given very inadequately in this book no one knows better than the author. He wishes he could start all over again and try to answer them better. But such as the answers are he believes in them. They have been burned into his being by the fires of experience.

At the close of this summer's session of the Sat Tal Ashram in the Himalayas, after the author had gone over the manuscript with a keen group, one of the keenest minds I know, in East or West, an Indian, said, very thoughtfully, "Well, Christianity is really true, isn't it?" Although he had been a Christian all his life, it seemed a very glorious dawning of a very glorious fact. The same impression has been made on the author as he has gathered the evidence: Christianity is true! And if it is true, then that is the best news that this world contains.

After my return to America I went over the manuscript at the two Ashrams at Saugatuck, Michigan, and Blue Ridge, North Carolina, and got the suggestions and reactions of an American group. And much of their wisdom has been embodied in this book, for which I am more than grateful. The comment of a very thoughtful layman interested me: "Within ten years the viewpoint and attitude of this book will become common property in the Christian Church, and when it does, it will create a Christian revolution." Whether in his enthusiasm he overstated the matter, I am not sure. For I know what a rough-hewn attempt this is to express something that has got hold of me very deeply. Whether it creates a revolution in the Christian Church, certainly it has created one in me. I see now as I have never seen the eternal fitness of the gospel—it fits the soul like a glove fits the hand. They are made for each other. But it not only fits the soul, it fits the body and the mind in the same fashion. Physically and mentally we are fashioned in every fiber and nerve cell to obey this Way as the law of life. To live in any other way is to live against oneself and hence to stultify oneself. This is also true of sociological living—the laws of human society when we

FOREWORD

really discover them are the laws of the Kingdom of God deeply embedded in the relationships of people, the way those relationships work when they work well and harmoniously.

I have always believed these things, in rather a vague way, but now they have become overwhelming. I do not hold them any more—they hold me.

To the nontheological reader, the first chapter from the sixteenth page on may prove a little tedious. If so, I suggest that you skip it. But I have felt that I must lay the foundations of the Kingdom of God as realism in the pages of the New Testament if it is to hold the Christian conscience. In these first pages I have tried to expound the mind of Christ as realism. I have only touched the fringes of that mind, I know, but everything there seems to point in one direction, namely, realism. If this is so, we may have to change mental gears about Him, for many of us have thought of Christ as a very stimulating, but impractical idealist. If we discover that He was a realist—a realist so far ahead of us in actual life and achievement that we think Him an idealist, then we must change our whole attitude toward the Christian gospel. It is not something that we can take or leave alone. For it stands before us—and in us—as Destiny. It is the way that we are made to live, and to try to live some other way is not only foolish but impossible. You cannot live against life and get away with it.

E. STANLEY JONES

150 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

INTRODUCTION

THE INCREASE OF EMOTIONAL AND SPIRITUAL MALADJUSTMENT in this chaotic modern world is well known. For thirty-five years I have been a surgeon seeking the diagnosis and cure of organic disease and injury. One would suppose that a surgeon would, from the very nature of his work, have a physical bias in his approach to disease. But I also have had ample opportunity to observe the effect of lack of spiritual harmony upon the whole organism. Anger, fear, resentment, antagonism, jealousy, hate, the sense of inferiority or guilt, and the like are all so important in the consideration of a patient's story that I have come to believe they play a predominate rôle in the majority of even surgical cases. Too often, for instance, does the thyroid surgeon see a goiter patient precipitated into a crisis by an emotional storm. The gland may undergo deleterious transformation from harmful emotional stimuli, and then in itself become the site of chemical and metabolic processes continuing the emotional instability, a vicious cycle being thus established. Fortunate, indeed, is such a patient if he fall into the hands of an understanding physician who can calm the storm and bring peace and confidence. In this way alone is it possible to initiate successfully the medical and surgical regime which so often leads to complete and permanent cure. In like manner, in the history of a victim of stomach ulcer, the essential facts may have to do with maladjustments or environmental difficulties, and it is certainly true that no organic cure can be permanent until a solution for these be found. This lack of harmony in the realm of the spirit may lead to functional disorder and to organic disease which cannot be cured before adjustment of the underlying conflict.

A large majority of the surgical cases which come to me should

INTRODUCTION

never really have come. They could have been headed off by the acceptance and practice of the way of life that Dr. E. Stanley Jones outlines in this book. For most of these cases—not all, of course—began as wrong moral and mental attitudes in the patient. These wrong moral and mental attitudes created functional disturbances in the physical organism, and these, in turn, became organic or structural disease. At this point I get them as a surgeon, but they could have been headed off by the kind of Christianity presented here.

Dr. E. Stanley Jones gratefully recognizes what science has done, is doing, and will do for the relief of organic disease. For his part, by spoken and written word, he is pointing the way out for countless sad, discouraged, hopeless souls, and in this book points to Him who, above all others, is able to drive from the soul of man all these unlovely harmful things “through the expulsive power of a new affection.”

There can be no doubt of the scientific soundness of the facts presented in this book, nor can there be any doubt that the future well-being of the world depends upon the bringing together in harmonious co-operation medical science and the kind of religion which this book represents.

ADRIAN S. TAYLOR, M.D.

Chief Surgeon and Superintendent

Clifton Springs Sanitarium and Clinic

Clifton Springs, N. Y.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

WAS JESUS A REALIST?.....	13
---------------------------	----

CHAPTER II

LIFE'S ANSWER FROM LIFE.....	44
------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?.....	53
-------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER IV

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU.....	67
--	----

CHAPTER V

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE.....	99
---	----

CHAPTER VI

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS.....	110
----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VII

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED.....	128
---	-----

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VIII

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH.....	149
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX

THE HOUSE DIVIDED.....	162
------------------------	-----

CHAPTER X

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH.....	174
-----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM.....	208
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE.....	244
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIII

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM.....	261
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER I

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

MY QUEST FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS REALISM began in a rather dramatic fashion. In a former volume I recounted a portion of an incident in Russia. The full story was this: I was talking to a highly intelligent actress—and actresses in Russia are usually highly intelligent—when she asked, “I suppose you are a religious man?” To which I replied, “Yes, I suppose I am.” “Ah,” she answered, “you are religious because you are weak. You want someone to hold your hand—you want God to hold your hand.” And she took my hand to show me what she meant! Religion was for the weak, for those who belonged to the escapist mentality, for those who needed comfort. I could reply that I did not want religion as comfort but as adequacy—adequacy to meet life when life was full of temptation, difficulty and injustice; further, I did not want God to wipe away my tears, I wanted Him to give me a handkerchief to wipe away the tears of someone else; I did not want Him to hold my hand, but to strengthen my arm that I might stretch out a helping hand to the inwardly and outwardly beaten. I wanted religion as adequacy. Seeing that she was off the track there, she replied with this: “I suppose you are an idealist?” “Yes,” I replied, rather hesitatingly, “I suppose I am.” “Au revoir,” she said with a wave of dismissal, “I am a realist.”

Marxian Communism was realism and Christianity was idealism! It set me to hard thinking; in fact, it began to haunt me for months. The implication back of all this was that Christi-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

anity had built up a world of idea and had taken refuge in the unreal ideal, that it lived in this world of unrealized thought, that it took refuge in it away from the hard and pressing problems of life, that it was for the "tender minded," for those who wanted to escape from rather than solve the problems of life—it was mental and spiritual opium. If true, this is disconcerting to say the least.

To get to the core of the matter let us define our terms in the simplest manner possible. Realism is pre-occupation with and devotion to fact, and idealism is pre-occupation with and devotion to idea—even if that idea be a supreme idea and a highly moralized one. Then is the Christian gospel idealism, or is it realism? As we follow Christ and His Kingdom are we pre-occupied with and devoted to idea, or to fact? Was Christ an idealist or was He a realist?

Of course, when we speak of fact we do not mean hard, tangible physical fact alone, but fact whether mental, spiritual, or physical. For that there are facts which you cannot touch only the crassest materialist would deny. And this kind of materialism is dead—killed by the intangible facts which science and religion are discovering as part and parcel of the universe and of our own lives. "Have you ever caught God in a test tube?" a student asked me one day, to which I replied: "No, but have you ever caught love in a test tube? Is love thereby unreal?" When science throws its net into the sea of reality, there are many things which slip through the meshes of its method when it draws its net to the shore of observation. And these things which slip through may be just as real as the things which were caught by this method. And no one knows this better than the scientists themselves. In fact, they are more and more looking on the tangibles and the intangibles as parts of the one reality. Both are facts.

A governor in the East, hearing of my subject, asked if I were going to discuss whether Christianity was philosophical

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

idealism or philosophical realism. I replied that I hoped to lift the discussion out of that verbal tangle and base it on the commonplace meaning of the words. In general parlance when we speak of an idealist, we mean a man who is devoted to ideas—good ones, it may be, but on the whole to ideas that have not been realized. When we speak of a realist, in the sense of this book, we mean one who is devoted to fact—one whose feet are upon the earth, though his head may be in the sky. I say that "his head may be in the sky," for he is not earth-bound in his realism—he feels that there are realities which are eternal, which, while not fully embodied, are in the process of being embodied in the temporal order. The realist is not drunk with the wine of ideas which are forever apart from realization, but sober with devotion to fact and to ideas which he is realizing into fact. The realist has ideas, plenty of them, but never as mere ideas—the ideas are under the discipline of the facts, and are in the process of being made fact. Can a realist have ideals? Yes, of course, but only if those ideals are in the process of being realized. If they remain only as ideals in his mind, then the realist has ceased to be a realist. When Dr. Georgia Harkness defines an ideal thus—"An ideal is an idea which has gathered sufficient emotional and volitional momentum to control conduct," I can accept it, for when idealism controls conduct, it is no longer mere idealism, it has become realism.

When Professor Macmurray says that the next great step within Christianity is to cleanse away its idealism, what does he mean? He means that we have built up around the realism of the Christian gospel a great deal of inoperative idealism, and devotion to this inoperative idealism has been and is mental and spiritual opium. It has taken the place of the realism of the New Testament and has made us unfit to grapple with problems in the individual and collective will. Its answer is a verbal answer instead of a vital answer. All this ideal verbalism

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

must be cleansed away, says Professor Macmurray. And he is right.

But is Christ a realist? We have looked on Him as The Great Idealist. Will we have to change mental gears about Him and gear into the fact that He was a realist? And will the Christian gospel have to be looked upon as realism? With this question burning in my mind I went back over the New Testament to find out. After some years I have emerged, not with a burning question, but with a burning conviction that Christ was a stark realist. The whole atmosphere of His life and teaching was realism. He was not a philosopher spinning theories about life, but One who was giving His answer to life out of life itself. You cannot tell where His words end and His deeds begin, or where His deeds end and His words begin, for His deeds were words and His words were deeds, and His deeds and His words coming together with what He was became the Word made flesh, a fact. It is a realism so far ahead of us in accomplishment that men think it an idealism, but it is, nevertheless, a realism.

But in my eagerness I am anticipating. This is a very large assumption. Is it founded on fact? Turn to the New Testament with this as the key and see what it unfolds.

Luke, the most careful historian of the Gospel writers, begins his Gospel by saying that he was giving a "narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us"—(Luke 1. 1)—the "matters" were "fulfilled"—they were facts. The atmosphere was not that of a philosopher speculating on mere ideals, but of a historian dealing with ideals which have become fact. Hence he continues that those who were chosen to proclaim this Good News were "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (ver. 2). Note that only those could be "ministers" of this word who were "eyewitnesses," observers of a fact. Had the gospel been idealism or philosophy, this would not have been necessary, the ministers could speculate on life "unclouded by a single fact." But not here. For the "minister" of this word was an

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

"eyewitness," one who had seen this Fact and was devoted to it. He could only proclaim this word as he proclaimed it out of a life experience with this word, for this word was not a verbal word, but a vital word, a Fact.

This determines the character both of the Christian gospel and of the "minister" of that gospel. He is proclaiming an accomplished Fact—the Fact of Christ, and he must proclaim it as a fact operative within himself. The Word became flesh in Christ, and it must become flesh in the minister or it is a dead word—not the word of the gospel.

The Christian gospel begins with a Word, a redemptive Word, sounding out of the very nature of the redemptive God. That Word was the outreaching of the very nature of God expressing itself in loving redemption. God being what He was, Love, that Word could not be contained within the bosom of God—it had to sound forth in redemptive search of erring children. But the Word would not remain a mere word—it had to become the "Word made flesh." Had it remained only a Word, it would have changed the whole character of the Christian gospel—that gospel would have become an idealism. Its answers would have been verbal answers. But when the Word became flesh, it determined the nature of the Christian gospel as realism. Its answers are vital answers.

The gospel was founded on the very nature of God and not merely on an idea which God had. Had it been founded on an idea that God had, then it would have been idealism, but being founded on the very nature of God it becomes, by its very nature, realism.

But that Word becoming flesh also determined our attitudes toward the material. The material became the vehicle of the divine Revelation, and as such was not to be despised or given a second-rate place. If the material was God-made in the beginning and God-chosen in the Incarnation, then how could it be man-rejected in working out the purposes of that Incarnation?

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

No, the gospel would be frankly materialistic, it would take the material seriously. It would be included in the purpose of redemption not merely as object, but as agent. The material would be honored as a redemptive agent—its place, therefore, forever assured as honorable. God joined together matter and spirit in the Incarnation, and what God has joined let not man put asunder.

Moreover, God, in the Incarnation, not only made honorable the material, He made significant the historical. The Word was made flesh in the stream of human history and human history as such takes on significance. It is no longer a mere conglomeration of chance happenings without meaning, purpose, or goal. Now it has all three—it has significance, for God has put significance into it by showing us its meaning in the Person of Christ; it has purpose in that God is determined to redeem history through History; and it has goal in that the Kingdom of God is to come on earth, so is to be the goal of all our longings and strivings.

Further, the Incarnation makes significant the upward movement through science and education and human uplift, for the Incarnation means, not only God coming down, it means man coming up. A human brain, a human body, a human soul was offered to the Divine to be the vehicle of the coming of the Divine into human life. The vehicle was not despised, but dedicated. This makes sacred all that is fine and noble in the upward urge of man. If God used the finest flower of human life to show Himself, shall He despise other human life as it flowers in lesser forms in science and art and religion? He stamped all this upward urge with the Divine approval when He used the finest of it for His Incarnational purposes.

The attempt to discredit and despise all movements of science and mysticism in behalf of an emphasis upon the Divine Invasion into human life is, therefore, to misread the meaning of the Incarnation. The Incarnation shows us God, but it also shows us man and his possibilities. Human history comes under

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

the judgment of God in the Incarnation, but that judgment is not all adverse. Had it been all adverse, it would have meant that God had failed to do anything worth-while with man prior to the Incarnation.

No, the Incarnation shows us realism about God and realism about man and makes history significant and science and art and culture possible instruments of the Divine.

If the gospel had been idealism, Jesus would have said, "Salvation is of the Greeks"—they believed in Idea as the only real; but Jesus said, "Salvation is of the Jews"—they believed that the idea had to become embodied in the historical.

When the message was first given, it was given not to religious priests, but to shepherds, men of action who were fulfilling their ordinary duties. This put the message into the stream of ordinary life, instead of into the line of dry-as-dust speculation and religious rituals. Had it come to the priests, they would have searched sacred texts to see if it were valid according to the past. On the contrary, these men of action said: "Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing [Marg. "saying"] that has come to pass." Note that this "saying" was a "thing"—something that had "come to pass;" the word and the fact were one. The angels said to them that "the Sign was a Babe"—the sign was not some mystic light as India would have said, but a fact, an incarnate fact, a Babe.

When that Babe grew and became a man, He laid aside His carpenter's tools one day and went into the little synagogue at Nazareth and announced His manifesto of good news to the poor—the economically disinherited; release to the captives—the socially and politically disinherited; the opening of the eyes of the blind—the physically disinherited; the setting at liberty them that are bruised—the morally and spiritually disinherited, and the proclaiming of God's year of Jubilee—a fresh world beginning. Here was spirituality ("the Spirit of the Lord is upon me") functioning as redemption to the economic, to the social

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and political, to the physical, to the moral and the spiritual, to the collective. The whole of life was to be faced realistically and redeemed. He ended by saying, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your ears"—the Manifesto had been fulfilled in Himself, the Manifesto and the Man were one, the Program and the Person had come together. When He thus joined the two, He made it realism, and not idealism.

When that Program began to be put into effect, the people who heard and saw Him were amazed, saying, "What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits and they obey him" (Mark 1. 27). A new teaching! With authority He commands! He did command for His teaching was a doing, an act, a fact.

It was no mere chance that the first invitation which Jesus gave to His prospective disciples was, "Come and see" (John 1. 39, Moffatt),¹ and those same disciples, catching the cue from Him, said to the questioning Nathaniel, "Come and see" (John 1. 46, Moffatt). Not, Come and think about an idea, but, Come and see a Fact.

When He finished the Sermon on the Mount, which has been looked on as the very essence of idealism, what was the impression He left upon His hearers? That of an impossible idealist announcing an impossible program? Hardly. On the contrary, "When Jesus finished these words, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as their scribes" (Matthew 7. 28, 29). The authority was the presentation of facts so self-authenticating as to be inescapable. The scribes had quoted authorities, but He spoke with authority—the authority of immediate insight, firsthand acquaintance with facts, the authority of the facts themselves. It was said of a cer-

¹ All quotations in this volume taken from *The Bible, A New Translation*, by James Moffatt, are reprinted by permission of Harper & Brothers, New York.

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

tain man that "his words were half-battles." This Man's words were whole facts.

He did not use such words as "I hope so," "I think so," "perhaps," "it may be," but such words as "Verily, verily, I say unto you." He almost never used the subjunctive mood, seldom used the imperative, but almost always used the indicative. When He did use the imperative, it was to enforce the implication of the indicative. By the use of the indicative He showed Himself as a revealer of the nature of reality—He was declaring what *is*, and bade men to relate themselves to that reality. Otherwise they would find themselves trying to live against the nature of things. He did not say, "Blessed will be the poor in spirit," but "Blessed are"—He was announcing facts operative here and now.

The Sermon on the Mount breathes the air of realism in every line. In cutting the root of murder at the place of anger; the root of adultery at the place of looking; the root of false swearing by abolishing all swearing; the root of wars and clashes by forbidding all revenge and all hating of enemies; the root of all unrealism and play-acting in giving of alms, praying and fasting; the root of Mammon by repudiating its sway; by getting rid of anxiety about tomorrow and living for today; by ceasing to have critical attitudes toward others and judging them; by the application of the Golden Rule to human conduct; by insisting on the entering into life through discipline—entering a narrow gate; by emphasizing that good fruit can only be had from good trees; by summing up the whole thing in His insistence that the man who acts on His way will be a man whose house is on rock and will thus be able to stand up against life when floods and storms do their worst—in all these things there is stark realism. He lays it all down with an air of finality: take it or leave it, but this is the way to live.

And yet it was free from dogmatism and fanaticism. There was an air of quiet certainty that did not need to rave or pile

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

adjective on adjective to enforce dubious statements: He seldom used adjectives—He stripped language of all verbiage and reduced it to fact. The language and the fact are so intertwined that they seem like the words and music of a song. The facts were speaking in the language of words, but in a language which was itself fact.

And when men, used to veneer and seeming, hesitated to take His words about the inner life as fact, He quietly lifted up a corroborating outer fact: "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed and go unto thy house"—the outer and the inner facts spoke the same language—the language of realism.

As men saw the revolutionary character of what He was saying and doing they felt their ancient systems being shaken to the depths. Jesus corroborated their fears by quietly saying that the new wine of the Kingdom must be put into new wineskins—new forms and new institutions must be created to hold this revolutionary ferment. He showed that God was on the side of the fermenting wine of revolution, as well as on the side of retaining wineskins. Forms could be retained only if they were constantly being changed to suit the expanding nature of reality. In this He was utterly realistic.

When John the Baptist, puzzled at what was happening, sent word by his disciples to ask whether Jesus was the coming One or must they look for another, He replied, not with a verbal message of assurance, but by calling attention to the authority of the facts produced: "The blind receive their sight, . . . the lepers are cleansed, . . . the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. Blessed is he whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me." He was completely realistic in presenting the facts instead of an argument. But He went further and made an astonishing statement in closing: "Blessed is he whosoever shall find no occasion of stumbling in me." Ordi-

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

narily you would have expected Him to say that He Himself was blessed if no one found occasion of stumbling in Him, but instead He says, "You are blessed if you find no occasion of stumbling in Me." The meaning apparently is that He was so identified with reality that if you stumble at Him you stumble at reality.

But that reality, He insisted, should be tested both in Himself and in them by a simple realistic test: "By their fruits ye shall know them"—the outcome is the criterion. You cannot tell what life is except through its manifestations. Through the centuries no better test has been discovered. Note that He insisted that it was the "fruit," not the bud or blossom, but the finished product that was the test. This was correct, for everything has to be put under the test of life to see what life will do to it, to see what emerges finally. In the beginning stages, the bud and blossom stages, the nature of the thing is not clearly seen, not until the fruit stage, the finished product. In this He was further realistic.

Usually one tries to win converts to his movement by painting it in optimistic colors, that men may be more easily drawn to it. Not He. He told His followers that three quarters of their efforts to bring in this new order of God's Kingdom would be lost—that some seed would fall on the wayside, the stony ground and the thorny ground, that only one soil out of four would be fruitful. And subsequent history has shown that He was absolutely right about this. It works out just about that way. At least I have found it so across the years. But if He was realistic on the difficulty side of things, He was also realistic on the possibility side of things when He said that the good ground would bring forth thirtyfold, sixtyfold, a hundredfold—3,000, 6,000, 10,000 per cent on the investment. Invest in persons, and when you touch this one and set him afire, he touches another, and he another, and so on almost *ad infinitum*. An African proverb says that "any fool can tell how many apples there are on a tree, but it takes a wise man to tell how many trees are in an apple." The possibilities

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

in trees and persons are overwhelming. But in both the difficulty and the possibility phases He was equally realistic.

Even so, while He saw the possibilities of this seed-sowing, sometimes He refused to do it: "Great multitudes came to hear and to be healed of their infirmities. But He withdrew Himself in the deserts and prayed." He refused to do good. He refused to do good in order to do a higher good—to Himself. His greatest gift was Himself, so He must keep that self at its highest. Hence the prayer hour was kept intact in order to keep a higher contact. In this He was realistic.

In the midst of His sense of world mission He remembered His mission to Himself. But He also remembered His mission to other selves, to individuals. In the midst of a world-encompassing movement He might have been careless of the individual, but He never was. He was so interested in the individual that those who are impressed with this fact have often forgotten the framework of a world-kingdom in which this interest was manifest. To be able to hold a world-vision with detailed interest in the individual—this is a realism that extends from the macrocosm to the microcosm—the whole range of life.

The need of that individual was supreme. Note the places where need was the determining element: "Jesus took the loaves, . . . and distributed them . . . as much as they wanted" (John 6. 11, Moffatt). As much as they wanted was as much as they needed. Again: "Did you never read what David did, when he had need, and was hungry, he, and they that were with him?" (Mark 2. 25). He took the sacred shewbread and fed himself and his men—made a physical need take precedence over a sacred symbol. Jesus approved this thereby making the elemental physical needs of men one of the first demands on religion. If it did not minister to human need, it missed its purpose. Again, in the parable of the laborers in the vineyard Jesus made the householder say, "It is my will to give unto this last as much as unto thee." Why this equality of distribution? Because there was

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

an equality of need. And in making the householder say this, Jesus was, in fact, making God say this—God treats men according to need, and wills to give an equality of distribution according to need. This distribution extends both to the physical and spiritual needs: “He will arise and give him as many as he needeth.” This principle of distribution according to need was put into operation in the collective life of the Church under the inspiration of the spirit of Jesus. “They would . . . distribute the proceeds among all, as anyone might be in need” (Acts 2. 45, Moffatt). “It was then distributed according to each individual’s need” (Acts 4. 35, Moffatt). And the principle is further approved by Paul in the quotation:

“He who got much had nothing over,
and he who got little had not too little.”

(2 Corinthians 8. 15, Moffatt.)

This distribution according to need runs like a golden thread through the whole account and is not something extraneous introduced here and there. But if they were to receive according to need, they must also give according to ability: “If any will not work, neither let them eat.” Moreover, the same principle Jesus applies to Himself. When He sent for the colt, He told His disciples to reply if any questions were asked: “The Lord hath need of it.” He too came under the principle of “to each according to his need,” for He was giving to others “according to His ability.” He was not laying down one set of principles for them and another for Himself—to everyone it was according to need. And this is realistic.

This care for the individual extended to the child. When the disciples, missing the whole attitude of the Kingdom, of equality of opportunity to all, disputed in the way as to which of them was greatest, He set a child in the midst and said, “Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name receiveth me.” The Lord of heaven and earth identifies Himself with a child, and to receive the child is to receive Him. Never was the

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

worth of the individual more amazingly affirmed than here. But note how it is affirmed: He "set him in the midst of them"—that is science. Science studies objectively the child set in the midst. But there is a step further: "And taking him in his arms"—that is religion. It sets up a relationship of love. Much can be understood about the child through science studying the child objectively, but much more can be discovered about the child by taking it up into your arms and loving it. Both attitudes are necessary if one is to understand the child. The scientific and the religious attitudes working together would truly interpret to us the child and would interpret the child to itself. In calling in both attitudes Jesus was truly realistic, for one without the other is unrealistic.

But this extension of help according to need extends not only to the child, but to those of another race. The parable of the good Samaritan says that you must not "pass by on the other side" when you meet human need even if that human need be in a man of a different race. He thus strikes at the compartmentalism of their thinking and acting, for they had made loving your neighbor to mean to love your Jewish neighbor—and He strikes at it in a most effective way by making the hero a member of the despised race of Samaritans, so that despised race ministers to the so-called superior race of Jews—the Jew was helpless and in the hands of his Samaritan benefactor. Had it been the other way round and had the Jewish benefactor administered to the Samaritan, it might have left the mentality of the "brother bountiful" playing the benefactor to the helpless, which might have fed his superiority complex, already sufficiently developed. But Jesus knocked this superiority complex in the head by making the Samaritan the benefactor. And at the same moment He probably helped to cure the Samaritans of an inferiority complex, for, being a small group in the midst of a larger and more aggressive race of Jews which despised them (to call a man a Samaritan was to abuse him), they had probably developed an inferiority

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

complex. This parable struck at the inferiority complex of one and at the superiority complex of the other. In doing so it was subtly realistic.

When a scribe, carried away for the moment, said to Jesus, "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest," the Master punctured his momentary enthusiasm with the realistic words, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Jesus might have been tempted to get this scribe, for the marginal reading says, "One scribe," probably the only one that offered to follow Him. But he too was a scribe, a copyist of the past, and Jesus realistically told him so.

And when a woman, also carried away with the enthusiasm of the moment, called out of the crowd, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," Jesus immediately replied, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." Although James and Jude were blood brothers of Jesus, in their Epistles they never mention the fact. Jude says he was a "brother of James," but that he was a "servant of Jesus Christ." And the last thing we hear of Mary, the mother of Jesus, was that she was praying like the rest for the gift of the Spirit—this in obedience to the command of Jesus. All sentimentalisms based on blood were cancelled in the new relationship in the Kingdom.

He told a man who wanted to go and stay at home till his father died, so that he could give him a worthy and respectable burial, "Leave the dead to bury their own dead, but go thou and publish abroad the Kingdom of God"—you belong to the creative future, why waste your time with the ceremonious past. Nor would He allow a man to bid farewell to those at home, saying, "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." (Literally, "cannot fit into the Kingdom of God.") Newman was called "the father of all those who look back," but really Lot's wife was the mother of all those who look back, and this man and Newman were in the succession—

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

pillars of salt, tombstones of backward looking, of dead thinking. Life becomes crystallized when it looks back.

He could be as hard as granite on the real issue, but pliant and yielding on marginal things. Concerning Himself He said with an air of terrible finality: "He that is not with me is against me." He *is* the issue and men have to take sides. But *they* were not the issue, so when John told Him that they had forbidden a man to cast out devils because he followed not with the Twelve, He could say: "Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you"—you are not the issue, to follow with you is not the point; you must be liberal as far as you and your group are concerned, so that if a man is not against you he is for you; but concerning myself, I *am* the issue, and I must be adamant. Here He was completely realistic concerning Himself and them.

The center of unrealism was in the Pharisee, the most religious man of the day, and a great deal of the gospel narrative is the story of the clashing of the realism of Jesus with the unreality of the leaders of religion. He saw them compartmentalize their thinking and acting—"tithing mint, anise and passing over justice and the love of God"—justice which is love expressed toward man in human relationships, and love toward God. They didn't reject these—they passed them over, put them on the side, inoperative, something to be praised but not practiced, to be worshiped but not worked. Mint and anise occupied the center. And they became small with the smallness of their central interest. This fastening on to certain things in religion that ministered to themselves and passing by things that demanded change in themselves was to Jesus the essence of unreality. He exposed it—relentlessly and without mercy: blind leaders of the blind, whited sepulchers, men who cleansed the outside of the cup and platter and left the inside full of extortion and excess, hypocrites, playactors. Never were words freighted with such terrible meaning, or so heavy with judgment. They fall on the soul like doom. But these storms were necessary, for they cleansed an

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

atmosphere that had grown foul with religious unreality. We who are afar off now see more clearly into the heart of reality. And this Man of Realism did it.

Moreover, he brushed aside finicky scruples about clean and unclean food by saying that what mattered was not what went into a man but what came out of a man—the lies, the hypocrisies, the lustful looks—all these came out of the man, came out from his heart, the real man, and defiled him. “This,” he said, “making all meats clean”—and making all hypocrisy unclean. The reversal was one of the most important made in history and stamps Jesus as a supreme realist. I live among a people who have wasted the time and energy and economic resources of millions of people through centuries over this clean and unclean food business. Oh, that Christ had walked through India with these cleansing words upon His lips!

His challenge to the Pharisees came to a head one day at a feast. He openly asked them to renounce the looking for chief places, to stop binding burdens they do not touch with their little fingers, to throw themselves in with the lot of the poor, to humble themselves, to lose themselves in order to find themselves again. It was a tense moment and an embarrassing one. There was present a gentleman who hated embarrassing moments, especially at dinner parties—bad form, you know!—so he rolled his eyes and filled in the embarrassing moments with this pious platitude: “Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God.” He talked about eating bread and Jesus talked about giving bread; he talked about being in the Kingdom of God and Jesus talked about throwing oneself into it, losing oneself and being the agent of its coming. Jesus ended His parable by saying: “Not one of those who were bidden shall taste of my supper.” In other words: “You talk about how blessed it will be to eat bread in the Kingdom of God, I’m sorry, but you are not even going to get in. For you have made the Great Refusal.”

He summed up the whole condition of the Pharisees by saying,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

"Look therefore whether the light that is within thee be not darkness." Their very light, religion, which was to have been light for themselves and others, had turned to darkness. Instead of being a guide to the nation they and the nation were stumbling in the darkness to their doom. The Separatists had separated themselves—from God and His Kingdom.

Here the realism of Jesus drives like a lightning flash into the cavernous depths of religious unreality and we see the Pharisees—and ourselves. For Pharisaism is a continuing infection and not a burned-out disease. When men turned indignant over the sins of others, for instance over the sins of Pilate, and over the sins of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, He replied, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." He had a way of turning the other edge of the two-edged sword of truth upon the self-righteous.

When they watched Him to see whether He would heal a man of dropsy on the Sabbath day, He said to them, "Which of you shall have an ox or an ass fallen into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on the sabbath day?" And the comment of the writer is, "And they could not answer again unto these things" (Luke 14. 6). His answers were "things," not mere words, and they knew in their heart of hearts that He was not talking words but facts—"things"—and they had no answer to these "things." For there is no answer to the idea that a human personality is supreme and must be treated as supreme. It is a fact. As one of my friends put it: It just *is*. And into that fact men must fit their religious institutions such as the Sabbath, "for the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath;" they must fit governments, for man was not made for governments, but governments were made for man, and when they cease to serve man they have lost their right to exist; they must fit industry, for man was not made for industry, but industry was made for man, and when it ceases to serve man it has ceased to have a right to live; they must fit educational systems, for educational systems were made for man, and

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

not man for educational systems. Here we see uncovered the realism of ultimate truth about man.

This emphasis on the worth of human personality He extended to the woman. He called a woman "a daughter of Abraham," and thus used a phrase which had never been used before. The men were fond of being called "sons of Abraham," but they left out woman from the national inheritance. Standing in a world where polygamy reigned He brushed aside Moses and founded the home on the firm foundation of one man and one woman living together till death parted them—death physical or death spiritual—adultery. In thus laying the foundation of the home on the equal partnership of a man and a woman he planted the idea of the equality of woman with man, not on a verbal law, but on a vital life, not a legal form, but on an everyday working fact. This was realism.

In the redemption of the individual He seemed to care little or nothing of what people had been.—He thought only of what they were and what they would be. When the Pharisee saw the woman of the street touch Jesus, kissing His feet and wiping them with the hair of her head, he said, "This man, if he were a prophet, would have perceived who and what manner of woman this is which toucheth him, that she is a sinner" (Luke 7. 39). Note the Pharisee said "that she *is* a sinner"—to the Pharisee one who *was* always *is*; they are branded forever. To Jesus she *was* a sinner, but is not henceforth a sinner, for He stood between the woman and her sin. This willingness to forget and forgive the past He extended not merely to the flagrant sinner but to the respectable religious ones as well. In the terrible parable of the fig tree, to which the owner came three years seeking fruit and finding none, it is said, "Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it; and if it bear fruit henceforth, *well*; but if not thou shalt cut it down" (Luke 13. 9). Note: "If it bear fruit henceforth, *well*." That is the essential note of Christ—He thinks of the "henceforth" and not of the *has been*; He treats men accord-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ing to what they can and will be and not according to what they were. This is realistic, in that, by laying on men the obligation of the "henceforth," it saves from moral sentimentalism and flabbiness at the same time that it saves them from the inhibiting, cramping sense of past failure and guilt.

It was the mingling of the offer of grace to the weak and sinful with the creation within them of strenuous endeavor and a sense of responsibility that shows His realism. To be able to give and at the same time to create within the recipient a spontaneous initiative is not easy. Often in giving we sap the energies of those who receive. But Jesus said, "The water that I shall give unto him shall become in him a well of water springing up unto eternal life" (John 4. 14). "The water that I shall give . . . shall become in him a well"—the water given from without turns into a well within, the gift creates spontaneity, those who receive become creative. There is nothing so absolutely necessary as this, for Jesus in His emphasis on the loving Father might have left a lot of spoiled, dependent children. That He did not do so is a miracle of insight. His parable of the talents and pounds shows a terrifying sternness at the very heart of the love of God. If one does not work hard and develop his talents they are taken away and given to the one who has. Not to use is to abuse, and the gift is taken away. There is no spiritual attainment that will save us from the operation of this law—it is relentless. And yet when He finished these terrifying parables the account says, "When he had thus spoken he went on before, going up to Jerusalem"—He went on before, going up to Jerusalem—what for? To lay down His life for those to whom He had just spoken such hard truth. Here, then, we have the picture: the parable of the pounds and the talents re-echoes the voice of Nature, inexorable, taking away from him that hath little to give to him that hath—a rigid, unbending, unforgiving demand that we faithfully develop what we have or else it will be forfeited. This is the hard school of evolution and the survival of those who are spiritually fit and who develop their

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

talents. This is the onward march of Nature—the upward urge to higher life, but relentless to those who will not adjust themselves to this upward urge. But at the head of this upward procession is One, who “having thus spoken” both in Nature and in the New Kingdom, “went on before”—the goal and guide of this upward movement, giving in Himself the key to its understanding. But more than that, He goes up to a sacrificial self-giving at Jerusalem. The universe finds its consummation in sacrificial love—a cross! At the head of the procession is a thorn-crowned Man—the revelation of what God is and man is to be. These were His last words before arriving at Jerusalem—the end of the Road for Him. They sum up, as it were, the two voices coming out of life—the voice of inexorable law and the voice of quenchless love. And these two voices are one in Him. Never did realism so mingle the terrible and the tender as here.

As we look back over His teaching we see Jesus taking all His lessons from life. He used parables. The parable shows that the worlds of matter and of spirit are akin and that the laws that govern one govern the other. The parable plants spiritual truth in the heart of the life process, the ordinary life process—some of it very ordinary. He took lessons from the unrighteous steward and the unrighteous judge. Most of us would have been too pious to have used such illustrations. But Jesus was good, not goody-goody. He was willing to see any good in the otherwise bad.

He linked the material and the spiritual life into an indissoluble unity: “He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much.” . . . “If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?” (Luke 16. 11). He saw that mammon was basically unrighteous, it was linked to personal greed instead of to the public good, hence it was wrong. A system of “grab-and-take” is fundamentally unrighteous, no matter how legal it may be. But while it is basically unrighteous, you have to use it and have to be faithful in the use of it. If you are not faithful in the material side of

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

life how can God entrust to you the spiritual side, the true riches? Here is a definite material basis for the spiritual life. They are one. In giving His most spiritual teaching regarding the coming of the Holy Spirit He said, " 'He who believes in me—out of his body, as scripture says, streams of living water will flow' (he meant by this the Spirit which those who believed in him were to receive)" (John 7. 38, 39, Moffatt). Note: out of his body this living water will flow. In all probability we would have said, "Out of his heart the spiritual will flow." But no, Jesus, with no such dualism in mind, put the two together. The spiritual had a definite material basis and the material had a definite spiritual basis. The body and the spirit were two sides of one reality and Kingdom purposes were to control both.

How decisive and yet how realistic He was when He arrived at Jerusalem where the crisis would be precipitated!—"They come to Jerusalem: and he entered into the temple, and began to cast out" (Mark 11. 15). He came to Jerusalem and went straight to the point—the Temple and the exploiters. Many of us would have made the long journey with the best of intentions, and then after having arrived there would have accommodated ourselves to the situation, made terms with it, entered into a compromise, and ended with a feint instead of an honest blow. But Jesus was decisive; He never dodged or compromised—He met the issues fairly and squarely: "He entered into the temple, and began to cast out." And yet there is a sentence which qualifies this precipitate action. Mark 11. 11 says, "And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple, and when he had looked around upon all things, it being now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve." He looked around on all things—surveyed the situation at first hand, got the facts, and then—went out and slept over them! A sound procedure for every reformer: Look around on all things, get the truth at first hand, and then go out and sleep over the matter. See how the thing looks in the morning when emotions

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

have had time to cool off. If the issue is still clear at that time, then go ahead—straight to the temple. Now note the steps.

First: "He cast out." What force did He use in the casting out? He used force on the tables of the money-changers and on the seats of them that sold doves, for these tables and seats could not respond to moral force. On the sheep and the cattle He used the whip of small cords: "And he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen;" the "all" was "both the sheep and the oxen." On dumb animals He used the force of a whip of small cords, for they too could not understand moral force. But upon the men He used neither the whip nor other physical force, for they could understand moral force, so upon them He used that and that alone. To moral agents He said, "Take these things hence"—moral force was the weapon.

Every revolution needs a casting out—a cleansing of corrupt and effete forms and customs. But the revolution must not stop there: the account says: "And he taught, and said unto them, 'Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?' " He taught—He laid the foundations of the new order in their minds and consciences. No revolution will be lasting if it is not founded in intellectual and moral convictions. So after the storm that cleanses must come the positive teaching that re-enforces and confirms the new in solid convictions. "Teach, teach, teach," should be the resounding slogan of every constructive revolution.

But this teaching should be no narrow partisanship—it must teach the equal rights of all men: "Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?" "All the nations"—that is the truly Christian note. The point at issue here was the fact that the Jews had gradually pushed out the Gentiles from the Court of the Gentiles and had put sheep and oxen and money-changing in their place—things took the place of persons. Race and class prejudice became embodied in an institution. The place had become "a den of thieves," where they stole, not merely

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

money from their own countrymen, but rights from the people of another race. Every revolution will be permanent to the degree that it is just, and to the degree that it is just to all men. If it replaces one group of privileged people with another group of privileged people, the foundations of another revolution will be laid. The Christian revolution stands for the rights of a man as a man apart from race and birth and class—"all the nations" is its passionate belief and cry. All other revolutions stop at class, or color, or race, or nation—the Christian revolution stops at the last man and shares its last privilege with him.

But the revolution must go further—it must follow the casting out with healing process. "And the blind, the lame came to him in the temple and he healed them." Following the processes of tearing down there must come the processes of healing. In every revolution wounds are left, for many have privileges and power taken away from them. They must be won over, if possible, to the new order. The torn and ragged edges of things must be gathered together and woven into a garment that will hold within itself differing strands now blended into living symmetry. The test of a revolution will be found in its capacity to win over and amalgamate its former enemies.

The last thing to be noted in the Christian revolution is that the foundations of the new order must be laid in the minds and souls of the younger generation: "The children were crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David." When Jesus was asked to stop them, He refused, for He knew that what mattered in a revolution is whether the younger generation is in it or not. If it cannot win youth, it cannot hold the future.

To sum up the principles of the Christian revolution: (1) Do not deal with the marginal issues—go straight to the center, the Temple, the place of vested interest and power. (2) Look around on all things—get the facts, all the facts. (3) Then sleep over those facts and pray about them and see how they look in the morning when emotions have died down. (4) If they still seem clear in the

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

morning, then go straight to the temple and "cast out," using physical force on inanimate things and on animate things that cannot understand moral force, but on men use moral force alone. (5) Then teach constructively the meaning of the new order. (6) Make those meanings include "all the nations"—distribute privilege equally to all. (7) Then gather up by constructive good will the sundered elements and heal them into a living whole. (8) And above all, get the children, for the child is the future.

In laying the foundations of a constructive revolution He was realistic, as always.

As we look back over His life we find that the way He faced ordinary happenings had within it a universal principle always operative within those concrete situations. Mark gives a commonplace statement if we look at the mere collection of words—"As he was going forth into the way" (Mark 10. 17). But with Jesus every ordinary way became THE WAY. He transformed "the way" into THE WAY. The way He treated persons became THE WAY; the way He faced failure and death becomes to us THE WAY. His life becomes THE LIFE. "The life was the light of men." He acted in every action so that this action became a universal law. The realism of Jesus becomes our idealism and yet it remains a realism.

We began this study of the realism of Jesus by calling attention to the opening verse of Luke's Gospel that the Gospel was something "fulfilled," an act, a fact. This note begins there, but it runs through the whole. In the last chapter of Luke we find the disciples sadly summing up the impression Jesus had made on them in these words: "To God and all the people he was a prophet strong in action and in utterance" (Luke 24. 19, Moffatt). "To God and all the people"—Godward and manward He was strong—the God-emphasis did not overtopple the man-emphasis, nor did the man-emphasis displace or dim the God-emphasis. A great God and a great man were kept in the same universe. Moreover, "action" and "utterance" were both there and both strong.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

But note that the action was first. That was the impression He left—the action was primary and the utterance was the exposition and clarification of that action. In Acts 1. 1 it says: "I treated all that Jesus began by doing and teaching" (Moffatt). Note that here again the "doing" was first and the "teaching" was simply an exposition of the doing. Therefore His words were deeds, for they came out of deeds and not out of mere ideas. The same impression was made on the multitudes: "He doeth [not sayeth] all things well," they exclaimed. The impact was through a fact, the revelation was through a realism.

This tradition of realism which Jesus began was continued by His disciples: "He has poured on us what you now see and hear" (Acts 2. 33, Moffatt). Note "see" before "hear"—it was a fact to be seen, before it was heard as an interpretation.

He said in one place, "The Son of man must suffer many things"—of course He must; if He is the Son of man, for the sons of men suffer many things. If the Son of man enters into all these things, as indeed He must if His love is as broad as the human race and as deep as the deepest pit of suffering and sin to which men descend, then, of course, the Son of man must be "the Single Heart through which are forced the else unfelt sorrows of the world." The Emperor of China was the Son of Heaven—once a year before Heaven he accounted, among other things, for all the people he executed. He justified himself as one who carried out the decrees of Heaven. But Jesus was called not the Son of Heaven but the Son of man—touch man anywhere and you touch Him. He came not to proclaim the decrees of Heaven, but to be Heaven entering into Earth with all its pains and sorrows and sins. Being the Son of man He must suffer many things. But in suffering many things He becomes the very revelation of the Heart of Things.

In a former volume, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, I used the following paragraphs to show the concreteness of Christ in contrast to the mysticism of India. May I use them again, not in that contrast, but in the contrast of His realism with idealism?

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

Jesus the mystic was amazingly concrete and practical. Into an atmosphere filled with speculation and wordy disputation where "men are often drunk with the wine of their own wordiness" He brings the refreshing sense of practical reality. He taught, but He did not speculate.

He did not discourse on the sacredness of motherhood—He suckled as a babe at His mother's breast, and that scene has forever consecrated motherhood.

He did not argue that life was a growth and character an attainment—He "grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."

He did not speculate on why temptation should be in this world—He met it, and after forty days' struggle with it in the wilderness He conquered, and "returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee."

He did not discourse on the dignity of labor—He worked at a carpenter's bench and His hands were hard with the toil of making yokes and plows, and this forever makes the toil of the hands honorable.

We do not find Him discoursing on the necessity of letting one's light shine at home among kinsmen and friends—He announced His program of uplift and redemption at Nazareth, His own home, and those who heard "wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth."

As He came among men He did not try to prove the existence of God—He brought Him. He lived in God, and men looking upon His face could not find it within themselves to doubt God.

He did not argue, as Socrates, the immortality of the soul—He raised the dead.

He did not speculate on how God was a Trinity—He said, "If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." Here the Trinity—"I," "Spirit of God," "God"—was not something to be speculated about, but was a working force

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

for redemption—the casting out of devils and the bringing in of the Kingdom.

He did not teach in a didactic way about the worth of children—He put His hands upon them and blessed them, and setting one in their midst tersely said, “Of such is the kingdom of God,” and He raised them from the dead.

He did not argue that God answers prayer—He prayed, sometimes all night, and in the morning “the power of the Lord was present to heal.”

He did not paint in glowing colors the beauties of friendship and the need for human sympathy—He wept at the grave of His friend.

He did not argue the worth of womanhood and the necessity for giving them equal rights—He treated them with infinite respect, gave to them His most sublime teaching, and when He rose from the dead He appeared first to a woman.

He did not teach in the schoolroom manner the necessity of humility—He girded Himself with a towel and kneeled down and washed His disciples’ feet.

He did not discuss the question of the worth of personality as we do today—He loved and served persons.

He did not discourse on the equal worth of personality—He went to the poor and outcast and ate with them.

He did not prove how pain and sorrow in the universe could be compatible with the love of God—He took on Himself at the cross everything that spoke against the love of God, and through that pain and tragedy and sin showed the very love of God.

He did not discourse on how the weakest human material can be transformed and made to contribute to the welfare of the world—He called to Him a set of weak men, as the Galilean fishermen, transformed them and sent them out to begin the mightiest movement for uplift and redemption the world has ever seen.

He wrote no books—only once are we told that He wrote and that was in the sand—but He wrote upon the hearts and con-

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

sciences of people about Him and it has become the world's most precious writing.

He did not paint a Utopia, far off and unrealizable—He announced that the Kingdom of Heaven is within us, and is "at hand" and can be realized here and now.

He did not discourse on the beauty of love—He loved.

We do not find Him arguing that the spiritual life should conquer matter—He walked on the water.

He greatly felt the pressing necessity of the physical needs of the people around Him, but He did not merely speak in their behalf—He fed five thousand people with five loaves and two fishes.

Jesus has been called "the Son of Fact." We find striking illustration of His concreteness at the judgment seat. To those on the right He does not say, "You believed in me and my doctrines, therefore, come, be welcome into my Kingdom." Instead, He said, "I was an hungered and you gave me food; I was athirst and you gave me drink; I was in prison, and you came unto me." These "sons of fact," true followers of His, were unwilling to obtain heaven through a possible mistake and so they objected and said, "When saw we thee hungered and fed thee, thirsty and gave thee drink, sick and visited thee?" and the Master answered, "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these ye did it unto me." He was not only realistic Himself, He demanded a realistic life from those who were His followers.

He told us that the human soul was worth more than the whole material universe, and when He had crossed a storm-tossed lake to find a storm-tossed soul, ridden with devils, He did not hesitate to sacrifice the two thousand swine to save this one lost man.

He did not argue the possibility of sinlessness—He presented Himself and said, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"

He did not merely ask men to turn the other cheek when smitten on the one, to go the second mile when compelled to go one, to give the cloak also when sued at the law and the coat was taken away, to love our enemies and to bless them—He Himself did these

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

very things. The servants struck Him on one cheek, He turned the other and the soldiers struck Him on that; they compelled Him to go with them one mile—from Gethsemane to the judgment hall—He went with them two—even to Calvary. They took away His coat at the judgment hall and He gave them His seamless robe at the cross; and in the agony of the cruel torture of the cross He prayed for His enemies, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

He did not merely tell us that death need have no terror for us—He rose from the dead, and lo, the tomb now glows with light.

Many teachers of the world have tried to explain everything—they have changed little or nothing. Jesus explained little and changed everything.

Many teachers have tried to diagnose the disease of humanity—Jesus cures it.

Many teachers have told us why the patient is suffering and that he should bear it with fortitude—Jesus tells him to take up his bed and walk.

Many philosophers speculate on how evil entered the world—Jesus presents Himself as the way by which it shall leave.

He did not go into long discussions about the way to God and the possibility of finding Him—He quietly said to men, "I am the Way."

Many speculate with Pilate and ask, "What is truth?" Jesus shows Himself and says, "I am the Truth."

Spencer defines physical life for us as correspondence with environment—Jesus defines life itself, by presenting Himself and saying, "I am the Life." Anyone who truly looks upon Him knows in the inmost depths of his soul that he is looking on Life itself.

There is no deeper need in the world today than just this practical mysticism that Jesus brings to bear upon the problems of life. "No man is strong who does not bear within himself antitheses strongly marked." The merely mystical man is weak, and the merely practical man is weak, but Jesus the practical Mystic, glow-

WAS JESUS A REALIST?

ing with God and yet stooping in loving service to men, is Strength Incarnate.

If our rapid survey of the Gospels has taught us anything it has taught us that Jesus was a realist. As John puts it: "Grace and reality are ours through Jesus Christ" (1. 17, Moffatt). By a swift insight he thus sums up the Christian gospel: the grace manifested there is the uncovering of reality and is therefore sheer realism.

CHAPTER II

LIFE'S ANSWER FROM LIFE

WE HAVE SEEN THAT REALISM PALPITATES THROUGH every line of the Gospels, the embarrassment being to pick and choose, for the whole account shows one thing and one thing alone—realism. But it is when we arrive at the cross that the realism becomes most real, for here in death life becomes most living and is at grips with life's profoundest problems.

Do not think that during those last days Jesus was passively submitting, or surrendering to His enemies and to death. On the contrary, He was never more active and positive and dominant than in the last days. If He sweat drops of blood in Gethsemane, yet His chief thought was of His disciples, lest they fall into temptation; and when the terrible hours were over, He says to them, "Arise, let us be going"—let us go to meet what is ahead of us, I am ready. He stood between His disciples and the mob and urged that He be taken and they released. When Peter strikes with the sword, He assumes command and tells him to put up his sword, for Peter's method was spoiling His, and then He put His own in operation, leaning down and picking up the severed ear of the servant and healing him. He stood silent before Pilate and Caiaphas except when they ceased their unreality and touched a vital issue; then He spoke, but His silence was more terrible and commanding than His words, and the judge trembled before its awfulness. He tells the weeping women not to weep for Him but for themselves and their own sons and daughters. Hanging on a cross He was never more regal: He dispensed forgiveness to His

LIFE'S ANSWER FROM LIFE

enemies, provided for His mother, opened the gates of paradise to a penitent thief, refused the deadening drug that would have alleviated His suffering, and died with the triumphant words upon His lips: "It is finished"—it was finished and without a break anywhere.

He did something on the cross that day that penetrated to the depths of our problems and answered them. There are two ways to raise questions—one is to raise them academically, discuss them, and thus search for a logical answer. The other is to raise those questions in one's own being and life and then give the answer out of life itself, by life itself. Jesus did that on the cross. He raised in His own tortured body the deepest questions that life can raise. As He hangs there against the sky-line, His body seems to be twisted by torture into a vast question mark. He was raising along His tortured nerves every question that ever haunted the perplexed minds of men. As He cries out, "My God, why?" it seems that He is gathering up into that cry all the questions that have ever made men doubt the goodness and love of God and have made them cry out against the heavens.

What were some of the questions He raised in His body that day? First and foremost, He raised and answered the question of whether sin costs God anything, of whether He is the morally Indifferent lifted above all effects of sin and its consequences. The answer was decisive: God cannot forgive sin unless there is the red seal of His own blood stamped on that forgiveness. He can offer forgiveness only in a nail-pierced Hand. The Heart that forgives the brokenhearted must first be broken. Only out of that brokenness can wholeness come. Love substitutes itself, that the loved one be freed. It is the very nature of love to do this—there is no escape. The cross is the uncovering of the realism of love. All that the doctrine of atonement is trying to express is in the cross—and more. For it is an attempt to express the inexpressible, to frame what cannot be framed. He died for us—let that simple statement suffice us.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

But Jesus raised other questions that day which penetrate to the very heart of reality. And one of the questions He raised is one that is haunting the mind of humanity in this tragic hour of human history. It is this: How far can force go in this world? Is the last word in life with force? Is it the final arbitrator in human affairs? This question is being raised today in fiery tongues on a hundred battlefields. The answer? Whatever it is, the destiny of the world depends on it.

Well, the answer must be that force can go a long way. Jesus was crucified by force. Roman soldiers must have cynically laughed as they pressed His Hands to the cross and drove the nails through His flesh. He was helpless before this overpowering might. And thus it seems through human history. God is silent, or seems to be "on the side of the biggest battalions." What avails the rightness of your cause when faced with the might of their cannon? The heavens are silent, the earth soaks up the blood of the martyred, and life goes on indifferent to your virtue or your vice. So it seems. For no answering voice came back when He cried, "My God, My God—Why?" And it seems that this is the answer: There is no answer.

I stood in the Cathedral at Helsinki, Finland, on Good Friday and spoke to a cathedral that was so packed you could not get in or out—spoke to them about the cross. And clear up beyond the Arctic Circle a nation of deeply religious people listened in. And today? That nation itself is being crucified on the cross of superior might! We are driven to one dismal answer—the last word is with might. And when we say it, the light goes out on a morally dead world.

But wait. The answer has not yet been given. The question has only been raised. The cross raises the questions, but the resurrection answers them. Answers them in the same place where the questions were raised, namely, in the stream of human history, within life itself, in embodied life. Don't tell me that He only rose spiritually from the dead and that is the answer. That would

LIFE'S ANSWER FROM LIFE

not be the answer, for the questions were raised in the body and have to be answered in the body. To raise questions in the body and answer them in the spirit would leave us perplexed and dissatisfied. The question was embodied, the answer must be embodied. It was! The third day He arose from the grave, and the account says that the soldiers "were like dead men"—were like dead men before the might, the sheer might of this rising Life. Those soldiers and their might perished with the hour, but this Man lives on, His might unfolding with the passing centuries. He stands deathless—and mighty. For goodness and power are linked, indissoluble. He is the most living issue in the world today.

The answer then seems to be this: Today and tomorrow might has its day, it triumphs, but the third day it breaks itself upon the fact of God. God speaks and all mere might is "like dead men," palsied and powerless. And that is the history of humanity. Might produces the forces that lead to its own destruction. Perhaps not today and not tomorrow, but the third day it is so. When someone asked Dr. Charles Beard, the great modern historian, what lessons he had learned from history, he replied that he had learned four: First, when it gets darkest the stars come out. Second, when a bee steals from a flower it also fertilizes that flower. Third, whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. Fourth, the mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small. These four lessons from the schoolroom of fact corroborate what we learn from history in the cross and the resurrection. For here history was foreshortened, was seen in epitome, the answers were anticipated in The Answer. For it is a fact that when it gets darkest the stars do come out, when all seems lost God speaks and His word is victory. It is a fact that when the bee steals from the flower it fertilizes the flower—when we do a wrong to a people we stimulate that people. We enslaved the Negro and succeeded only in starting him on the road to an astonishing progress. When Germany in 1865 took away a portion of the territory of Denmark

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

the Danes determined they would make up in quality what they lacked in quantity. It actually turned out that they produced more on the remaining acres than they had on the larger territory. The great progress of modern Denmark begins from that national wrong. That stealing was a stimulation. Moreover, whom the gods would destroy, they do first make mad. When people lose their heads figuratively, they lose them literally. If you don't get an idea in your head, you get it in the neck! And, finally, the mills of God grind slowly, but they do grind exceedingly small. God doesn't have a payday at the end of every week, or every month, or even of every year, but He does have a payday, and men and nations pay, and pay to the last jot and tittle. God's mills grind exceedingly small and nothing escapes.

The answer of Jesus is the answer that is working itself out in history. With many a fear, many a hesitation, and many a doubt, man is learning that lesson. For it is being burned into his soul on many a battlefield—in fact, upon the whole field of history. "They that take the sword perish with the sword," is not only a statement of Jesus, but the solemn verdict of all history. It is the profoundest realism that was ever uttered. The dust heaps of dead empires are mute but eloquent witnesses of its truth.

The cross raises the question of how far force can go, and the resurrection answers it—answers it realistically. Force can go a long way, but not the full way. The first day and the second day it succeeds, but the third day, No!

Then the cross raises a further question: How far can lies go in this world? Jesus was crucified on half truths. They took what He said and twisted it into other meanings. And these meanings prevailed and crucified Him. This question, How far can lies go? Do they ultimately succeed and accomplish their purpose? is one that is haunting the mind of the human race. Propaganda is looked on as being almost as powerful as the sword. Untruth is being scientifically administered to us on a world scale. The first

casualty in war is truth. "Through propaganda," says Hitler, "you can make people believe that hell is heaven and heaven is hell." This is not a mere trite saying, but is being believed in and acted on on a world scale. We have developed a profound faith in the power of lies, scientifically administered. How far can lies go?

The cross raises that question and again the resurrection answers it. Lies can go a long way. Today and tomorrow they can and do succeed. Astonishing things have been done through them. But the third day the Truth rises from its grave, resplendent, victorious. Black lies fade out before the rising of the Sun. The Germans have the saying that "lies have short legs"—they cannot go far. The universe is not built for the success of a lie. A lie breaks itself upon the fact of the truth of God. No matter what you say or I say, the last word is to be with the facts, with Truth. The South Indian proverb expresses the facts in this vivid manner: "Lies are like a waning moon, but the truth is like a waxing moon." Passmore puts it this way:

"When all its work is done
The lie will rot,
The Truth is mighty
And will prevail when none
Care whether it prevail or not."

Lying propaganda is self-defeating. Confidence is shaken and no one believes anything. When Jesus rose from the dead the account says that the chief priests "gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept." They tried with large money to stop the news of the rising of Truth! I wonder how much money it would now take to choke off the fact of Christ, to wipe Him out from the world!

The answer, then, that Jesus gave to this question of how far

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

lies can go is realistic: Lies can succeed today and tomorrow, but the third day, No!

Take another question raised that day as He hung on His cross: How far can a good man's lifework fail? Can the results of his life investment be wiped out and the whole thing be lost? Is there a conservation of spiritual and moral energy as there is a conservation of physical energy? Or is the universe indifferent, and is Bertrand Russell right when he says, "Upon man and all his works the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark"? The cross raises that question, for as He hung there everything seemed to be lost, all His efforts had been frustrated, the fruits of His work gone. His disciples whom He had gathered and trained forsook Him and fled. His lifework was an ash. Can it be so with us?

The answer is that failure can go a long way in this world—today and tomorrow it can seem to mock all your hopes and endeavors. You can writhe on your cross of disappointment while your work, into which your lifeblood has gone, goes to pieces beneath you. Failure is a tragic fact in the world and no amount of blind optimism can change the tragedy of it. Defeat can be real and bitter. How long? Today and tomorrow, but the third day gloom gives way to gladness; one's lifework, like the disciples, comes up out of the gloom stronger and more radiant than ever. The gloom of the two days was necessary to toughen their fiber and prepare them for ultimate contribution. Jesus rises from the dead the third day and with Him His life's work. Now we know we cannot fail if our wills are aligned to goodness and truth. The founder of the Madnapalle Tuberculosis Sanatorium, perhaps the largest in India, founded it out of his own calamity—he himself was stricken with the disease and determined, through that calamity, to do something for other sufferers from tuberculosis. And did. When about to leave his lifework to others, he took the doctor in charge aside and said with a shaking voice, "Do take care of my baby, this Sanatorium!" And that doctor has dedicated his life to taking care of that "baby." But that "baby" has grown

LIFE'S ANSWER FROM LIFE

and is not only taking care of itself but has a number of offspring. Any man who labors honestly with God can say to life, "Take care of my baby." And it will. Nothing will ever be lost. It will all be gathered up here, or beyond the here. The eternal God has pledged Himself to that. And the pledge is the resurrected Christ, who was the world's failure, but who now is the world's success. But that answer could not be given verbally, it had to be given vitally, out of life itself.

Another question that was raised that day is this: How perfidious can man be? How far can he betray you? It was raised that day in an acute form. Never did man love men like this Man. And never was man let down more badly. Betrayed with a kiss, denied with an oath by a friend, deserted by all, let down by Roman justice, mocked in a legal forum, spat upon by the protectors of the innocent, slapped by his religious contemporaries, rejected by the populace whose crowning triumph was in the bitter words, "And their voices prevailed"—prevailed over justice, over love, over goodness. That is what man can be! Somebody has said that "every man goes about arm in arm with disappointment," and the greatest disappointment is just man himself. Man let down the Man!

What is the answer to this haunting question of the worthwhileness of man? The answer is that today and tomorrow he may let you down, but the third day he is transformed into a radiant apostle and ready to die for you. He will seal his faithfulness by being torn limb from limb by wild beasts, and though by uttering one syllable of falsity his life would be spared he will refuse that syllable. When Leonidas at Thermopylae resolved to stand and die for his country's cause, but wished to save the lives of two lads by sending them home with a message to Sparta, he was met by the answer, "We are not here to carry messages, but to fight and die." In like manner Jesus' apostles of the Good News not only carried the message, but died for the carrying of it—and they did it with a song on their lips. If man was unfaithful

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

for the first day and the second, on the third day he responded with an astonishing faithfulness unmatched in history. And that mighty stream of faithfulness flows on today producing the world's best work, and the world's best character—and the most faithful.

But that answer had to be given realistically, out of life. The fact is that no real answer can be given any other way. MacMurray says: "The reality of human life is action, not thought. . . . Whatever we think or say or will, reality is reality, and our reality is action, so it is action that has the last word." If so, then Jesus has the last word on these questions, for He answered them in His own person, out of His own life. And what an astonishing way to answer questions! To let those questions be raised along your own quivering nerves so that you yourself become the question, and then you make yourself the answer—that is an astonishing way to raise and answer questions—and the only way. Alongside of this way all academic answers seem cheap and tawdry. Jesus teaches us in the hard school of realism, and the answers have the feel of the real and the eternal upon them. In the presence of these answers you simply say, "There is nothing more to be said; this is Truth, incarnate Truth."

CHAPTER III

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

THERE ARE THOSE WHO WILL ADMIT THAT JESUS' WAY of facing life was realistic, not idealistic, and that He personally embodied realism, but they still question whether the message which He gave was realistic. The message He gave was the Kingdom of God. It was the center and circumference of all He taught and did. It was His gospel: "Jesus went about . . . preaching the gospel of the kingdom." And this was in the fitness of things. If there is a God, then that God must have made the world for a purpose; there must be plan in it, there must be government of it, a method by which it works. That plan, that purpose, that method would be the Kingdom of God. The simplest definition of the Kingdom of God is one that Jesus gave in the Lord's Prayer: "thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." The second phrase explains the first—the Kingdom of God is the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. And how would the will of God be done in heaven? Partially, in certain departments of life? In the individual, but not in the social arrangements, the collective set-up? To ask such questions is to answer them. Obviously, the whole of life must come under a single sway, nothing must be left out, it must be totalitarian, utterly so. The Kingdom of God is the master-conception, the master-plan, the master-purpose, the master-will that gathers everything up into itself and gives it redemption, coherence, purpose, goal.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

If God had no such plan for the world, what kind of a God would He be? An African tribe has this notion: "God is good and wishes good for everybody, but unfortunately He has a half-witted brother who is always interfering with what He does. The half-witted brother keeps on intruding himself and does not give God a chance." This quaint conception of God is interesting, but if God, after having made the world with apparent attention to detail in its planning, did not provide for a method and purpose in its working and goal for its end, then God not only has a half-witted brother, He Himself is half-witted, if one may say so reverently. He is half-witted if He undertakes to save the soul and leave the whole social order unplanned, or, worse, deliver it into the hands of mammon for direction. You cannot have a half-God ruling over a half-realm without implying a half-wit as God. Rather, we are driven to the conclusion that our conceptions, which leave God half-ruler, are half-witted, because half-Christian.

God must have a plan, and that plan is the Kingdom of God—God's order for human living.

While the phrase, "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," interprets in bare outline the meaning of the Kingdom of God, yet one has to turn to Christ Himself for the meaning of the Kingdom. For He presented Himself as the Kingdom personalized. He identified Himself with the Kingdom. "Auto-basilea, Himself the Kingdom," as Origen puts it. As He is the Incarnation of God, so He is the Incarnation of the Reign of God. As Flew says, "He was conscious of being the Kingdom." He made "for my sake" and "for the Kingdom's sake" synonymous. When Jesus stood before Pilate, He did not say "The Kingdom of God," but "My Kingdom"—He put Himself and the Kingdom together—in Him they had coalesced and were one. The supreme Order and the Supreme Person meet and are one. This makes our religion at once social and personal, for to have relationship with Christ is to have relationship with the new Order embodied in Christ.

This identification of Jesus and the Kingdom comes out clearly

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

at the trial of Christ. Before Caiaphas, the High Priest, the issue was: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mark 14. 61). He answered that He was. Before Pilate the issue was, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" (Luke 23. 3). Again He answered that He was. The Jews in their accusation put the two together, "Saying that He Himself is Christ a King"—the Messiah who would usher in the Kingdom of God, and more, He was that Kingdom. So He was an issue both with the Chief Priests and with Pilate. The Chief Priests said that He was "perverting our nation," making us disloyal to Caesar, by making the Kingdom of God and Himself supreme, identifying the two. He was also perverting loyalty to God, so the monotheistic Jews felt, by making Himself the "Son of the Blessed," or "the Son of God." Had He proclaimed God, that would not have put Him to death, but when He said that He was the Son of God, that made them tear their garments and cry for His death. Likewise Pilate would have been mildly interested if He had proclaimed the Kingdom of God, but when He said He was the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom was present in this King, then this made Him come to grips with all the Kingdoms of the world, particularly Caesar's. The Chief Priests were interested in the God side of the Kingdom of God and Pilate in the Kingdom side. Jesus had to give His witness to both, for He was both—He was God and He was the Kingdom of God—the incarnation of both. Caiaphas tore his clothes at the blasphemy of His confession, and Herod arrayed Him in royal purple in derision at His claim. It is clear that at the trial Christ and the Kingdom of God had merged and were a single issue. But not only at the trial are they a single issue—everywhere they are one. God not only redeems in terms of Christ, and through Christ, He rules in terms of Christ, and through Christ—the Kingdom is the Christ spirit regnant.

When we look at the Gospels as a whole, there are four great emphases: Matthew emphasizes the Kingdom; Mark, the Person of Christ; Luke, the human side; John, the experience of Life. These

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

four things are the Kingdom in four phases: Matthew throws the framework of the Kingdom around the whole movement—it is a movement to project the Kingdom into the whole of life; Mark presents the Person of Christ as the concrete illustration of that Kingdom, the Kingdom in perfect operation; Luke lets us see this new Kingdom taking hold of raw human material and refashioning it; John reminds us that the Kingdom is synonymous with Life. There you have the total picture: A Kingdom presented in a Person who remakes other persons, and these persons who accept it and live by it in individual and collective living find that this is Life.

This making of the Kingdom synonymous with Life is important. Elsewhere I have called attention to the fact that Jesus used "the Kingdom" and "life" interchangeably: "It is good to enter into Life maimed." . . . "It is good for thee to enter into the Kingdom of God with one eye" . . . (Mark 9. 43-47). Here Life and the Kingdom are one. If they are one, then the all-importance of this can be seen: You cannot live against Life and get away with it.

But Christ makes Himself synonymous with Life: "I am . . . Life;" if Christ is Life and the Kingdom is Life, then Christ and the Kingdom are one.

In Mark 13. 29 it says, "When you see these things coming to pass, know ye that he is nigh;" and Luke in a parallel passage says: "Know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh." Here "He" and "the Kingdom of God" are used interchangeably and so are one.

But there is another statement in a few verses above the passage in Luke which says, "Your redemption draweth nigh." Here the Kingdom and redemption are made synonymous. To accept the Kingdom is to accept redemption. This fits that passage in Revelation (12. 10, Moffatt), "Now it has come, the salvation and power, the reign ("Kingdom," A. V.) of our God and the authority

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of his Christ!" Here the Kingdom is made synonymous with "salvation and power"—it is redemption.

This redemptive movement meets three great needs as seen in Matthew 4. 23: "Jesus went about in all Galilee teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people,"—"teaching"—redemption for the mind; "preaching"—redemption for the soul; "healing"—redemption for the body. All this was, by its very nature, social: "among the people."

To sum up: The Kingdom is redemption for the individual and for the whole of society, and the Kingdom is Life and meets us in the Person of Christ.

It is no mere chance, then, that Jesus went to Caesarea Philippi, where there was a white rock with a grotto and a temple in which the image of Caesar was worshiped as God manifest in the flesh—went there to put the question to them, "Who do men say that I am?" They wanted Him to join forces against Caesar. He was doing so! But in a far more thoroughgoing and far-reaching way than they had ever dreamed. Here the great battle was joined: Is Caesar God manifest in the flesh? Is might the final word? Or am I God manifest in the flesh? Is right the final word? When Peter made the great confession that He was God manifest in the flesh, Jesus said to Peter, "I give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven." You have found the Key in Myself. You know the Kingdom as you know Me. I am the Key to its entrance and the Key to its understanding. If the objection is made that Jesus said "keys" and not "key," we should remind ourselves that Jesus is the Master-Key of life, and a master-key is a key made up of many keys. Or as a combination lock had for its key-letters C-H-R-I-S-T, so the lock of life has for its unlocking one combination: Christ!

Moreover, He said that if you have hold of Me as the Key to the Kingdom, then whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven—the facts which are embodied in Me are of universal validity, the same laws govern heaven and earth, and I am the embodi-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ment of those laws, the embodiment of the Kingdom of God. As Tennyson puts it: "Heaven and earth are threads of the same loom."

The Kingdom and Christ are synonymous—in Him God's absolute and final order confronts us with the imperious demand, "Repent." The Absolute Order meets us in the Absolute Person and the obligation laid on us is absolute—"Surrender." In surrendering we find ourselves in obedience to the final way of life.

To make the Church and the Kingdom synonymous is to spoil both. If the Church and the Kingdom are synonymous, then the Church must be absolute. But how can it be an absolute when made up of relative elements? If the Church were perfect, it would still be a relativism, for these perfect beings would only be relatively perfect—for they are in the process of an eternal growth. Hence the Church made up of growing beings, even at its best, can only be a relativism. For it must be by the very nature of things related to something higher than itself, from which it gets authority and the right to live. Only the Roman Catholic Church makes the Church and the Kingdom synonymous, and this Church was therefore bound to make itself infallible. But we know that the only thing infallible about the Roman Catholic Church is that it has been infallibly fallible like the rest of us! To identify the Church and the Kingdom is to leave Christianity floundering in the midst of its relativism with no absolute order to which we can look for absolute authority, to which we can give our complete obedience.

Christ made Himself synonymous with the Kingdom but never with the Church. Paul says the Church is the Body of Christ, but in using this figure he called attention to the fact that Christ was the Head of the Body—the Head, the master; the Body, the servant. The relationship is not one of equals, but of unequals—the one is the one who commands and the other the one who obeys. Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it that He might redeem it. But He never gave Himself for the Kingdom to redeem

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

it. For the Kingdom is itself redemption. It is not the subject of redemption—it offers it. The difference is profound. The Church may be, and is, the agent of the coming of that redemption, but it is the agent and not the Absolute. I am bound to be loyal to the Church to the degree that it is loyal to the Kingdom, but my highest loyalty is to the Kingdom, and when these loyalties conflict, then I must bow the knee finally to the Kingdom. Any false loyalty to the Church which would make it take the place of the Kingdom is destructive to the Church. When we make a relative thing into an absolute, then we have idolatry. A relative order trying to act the part of an absolute order becomes a strutting impotency. As the agent of the coming of the Kingdom it is a humble potency.

The Kingdom not only redeems in three phases, there are three phases of its coming: "HE WHO IS AND WAS AND IS COMING." (Revelation 1. 4, Moffatt.) He "was" and "is coming," but note that He primarily "is"—that is the first mentioned and therefore the special emphasis. Christ who embodies this Kingdom "is"—He is a present, all-enveloping, all-penetrating, inescapable Fact, the Great Contemporary. It is so with the Kingdom. The Kingdom "was"—it was prepared from the foundation of the world, built into its very structure, the method of its working, the laws of its being. It is its life and the world cannot live apart from it or against it. When it tries to do so it perishes. But this Kingdom not only "was," it "is coming." It is coming all the time as men receive it, coming as silently as the dawn. It steals through the thinking and purposes of men like leaven, stirring, changing, and redeeming. This gradualistic phase of the coming of the Kingdom was clearly taught by Christ—it comes like silent leaven, grows like a grain of mustard seed, develops like the corn, which is first blade, then corn, then full corn. Jesus emphasized this gradualism, and yet He was also emphatic about the catastrophic, apocalyptic coming of the Kingdom. In this He was realistic, for, though gripped by the fact of the sudden cataclysmic coming, He

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

did not overlook or despise the quiet, unobtrusive coming of that Kingdom in individual acceptance and in corporate permeation. His realism is seen when He taught that the Kingdom is coming like lightning and coming like leaven, coming like a blast and growing like a blade, coming with "power and great glory," and yet as unobtrusive and tiny as a grain of mustard seed—and as growing!

The Kingdom "is coming"—it is the Great Consummation to which the whole universe moves. It is that toward which everything must move or must perish. The most damaging thing Jesus could say of His generation was: "Save yourself from this *untoward* generation"—it was a generation not going toward the Kingdom, therefore it was "untoward," aimlessly drifting toward its own destruction. This very perishing is a coming of the Kingdom—it is the elimination of misfit living, of anti-Kingdom ways and methods. God is setting up His rule by the very self-destruction that is going on. Man is trying to live without God and can't. It won't work.

The Kingdom is coming, but primarily and fundamentally the Kingdom *is*. These emphases on the past and the future are essential, but not *the* essential. The essential thing to be burned into our thinking is the fact that the Kingdom *is*. "Thine is the Kingdom." God is ruling, and if man does not accept that rule, then so much the worse for man. If he attempts to put the Kingdom aside, he does not succeed in doing so. He does something else—he puts himself aside, renders himself unfit to live. When Kant said, "Two things strike me with awe: the starry heavens above and the moral law within," he was expressing the consciousness of a ubiquitous reign which he calls the moral law within. It is really the Kingdom of God within us—the law of our being, the way in which we are made to work. It does strike you with awe when you realize that the Kingdom of God is not an idealism which you can take or not take and nothing much will happen, that you might not get a reward in heaven by and by, but here

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and now life will go on undisturbed—I say it is an awesome thing when you realize that the Kingdom is something different, that it is within you, the moral law of your being, the way you live if you live at all. You can dodge an ideal, but you cannot dodge yourself. When you default against the Kingdom, you default against yourself, for that Kingdom is written in your very makeup. The Kingdom *is*.

But the Kingdom is also coming. Marx, following Hegel, said that the movement of history is from thesis to antithesis to synthesis. The thesis creates its opposite, the antithesis, and out of the clash of opposites—sometimes a catastrophic clash—the synthesis of these opposing truths is born, the consummation arrives. It may be that this great truth is being worked out on the stage of human history at the present time. World forces are at grips, thesis is locked in deadly embrace with antithesis, and out of this clash may be born the Synthesis, the Kingdom of God. And that coming may be sudden.

There was a time when I was afraid of this apocalyptic side of the coming of the Kingdom—it seemed materialistic, catastrophic, dependent on force, unethical. I now see my mistake. To separate the “ethic” and the “apocalyptic” is a species of dualistic thinking, as Macmurray has pointed out. Jesus did not teach an ethic—that would have made Him a moralist, teaching moral ideas. He was not a moralist teaching abstract codes of conduct. He was a proclaimer of a Kingdom—a Kingdom of fact, not a code of morals—and the coming of that Kingdom was the impinging of realism on unrealism, the displacing of unworkable ways with God’s workable way. Now, obviously, that Kingdom must come by continuity and by catastrophe—by a building up from within and a sudden tumbling of old structures. This gradualism produces, in a way, the catastrophic—the new undermines the old and there is sudden collapse.

We took the emphasis of gradualism partly from the New Testament and partly from the Liberalism of the day which thought

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

in terms of a "necessary progress." That idea of Liberalism has been smashed on a hundred battlefields. Progress is not "necessary progress." There may be terrible setbacks. And yet progress is there. The very tumbling of the house of modern civilization may be progress—its foundations were rotten and the superstructure had to come down. It is coming down in a world catastrophe. But the progress is there—gradual and catastrophic. Jesus said when you see these calamities come to pass "lift up your head, for your redemption draweth nigh." Things are going not aimlessly, He said, but according to schedule. Progress through catastrophe is just as much a fact as progress through gradual development. The Kingdom of God comes in the storm and develops in the seed.

And the apocalyptic coming is no more materialistic than the first coming. Apocalyptic means an unveiling—He was unveiled once in Incarnation, why should He not be unveiled again as the final Victor? And why should we shy at the materialistic? God made matter and "saw that it was good." He made man, planted him in a body, amid very material relationships, and his destiny must be wrought out in terms of matter. Unless our spirituality functions at the tips of our fingers in material contacts it doesn't function at all. We are not ghosts; we are embodied beings and the victory of life must be an embodied victory. The apocalyptic tells us of an embodied victory. I am no longer afraid of the apocalyptic—I welcome it, for it says that spiritual processes and outer completion, perhaps suddenly through catastrophe, are one process. Nor does science teach differently. Gradual progress has been supplemented, sometimes supplanted, by sudden leaps in nature—"emergent evolution" is Lloyd Morgan's term. The apocalyptic is not a contrast of the spiritual versus the spectacular, but the completion of the spiritual in outer demonstration in the total life. "He shall reign," and that reign will be on earth, and that reign will be in the total life. Don't ask me for details. I have none. The broad facts are enough for us to work on.

A note of warning must be uttered against the idea of "building

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

the Kingdom." The New Testament never tells us that we are to build the Kingdom. We are told to "see," to "enter," to "receive," and to "proclaim" the Kingdom, but never to build it. The difference? It is profound and far-reaching. For if we are to build the Kingdom, then it is something that we bring into life, something that we produce. But the Kingdom is already in existence; it is a fact, so it is something we "receive."

That men do not "receive" the Kingdom does not say the Kingdom is not present. God has never abdicated. He rules. But whether men "receive" that rule is another question. If they do not receive it, then all the worse for them, for the Kingdom then operates in self-frustration and self-destruction. Men hurt themselves if they do not receive the Kingdom. The law of gravity has always been here and men have progressed only as they have accommodated themselves to that fact, have obeyed the law. When they obeyed it, they did not "build" the law of gravity, they simply "received" it, received what was an existing fact. And they had to receive it "as a little child," had to give up all preconceived notions, had to sit down before the facts as a little child and be willing to follow to whatever ends nature leads them or they would know nothing.

We are to build the Church, but not the Kingdom, for the Church is a relativism built more or less after the pattern of the absolute, the Kingdom of God.

Jesus presents the Kingdom as a fact—the supreme fact of life. It is as definite as the force of gravity and more so. It is all-pervasive and all-inclusive. From the tiniest atom to the furthestest star, and through all the relationships of men, there is one dictum and only one dictum: "Obey the Kingdom of God or perish." For this "Kingdom is built from the foundation of the world." It is already built. It is part and parcel of our lives, the very laws of our being. Since it is already built—for God built it when He built you and me and the universe—then it is left to us to receive

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

it, to act on it. If we don't, then so much the worse for us; we perish.

To receive the Kingdom does not mean that there is to be no strenuous endeavor in making that Kingdom real to ourselves and our relationships. Men did not cease to strive when they discovered the force of gravity—they strove all the harder, but now they strove with, and not against, that force. When we “receive” the Kingdom, then we work with the nature of things, we work with the grain of the universe, we co-operate with reality, hence life becomes effective and rhythmical.

One possible misconception must be corrected—we are not identifying the Kingdom with the sum total of tangible things. The Kingdom is transcendent as well as immanent; it is built within the foundation of the world but it is also invading the world. Jesus said, “The Kingdom of God is within you,” and yet He also said, “It is at your doors.” The Kingdom is the divine invasion and the divine immanence. It is beyond Time, an eternal Kingdom, and yet it functions within Time. It is above History and yet it works within History. It is in Time and yet will never come completely within Time for the eternal cannot be fully packed within the Time process.

Jesus speaks of those who became “disciples to the Kingdom of God.” They were not builders of the Kingdom of God, but disciples of an existing fact. Of course we are to try to induce men to “receive” the Kingdom and thus extend the Kingdom’s redemptive sway, otherwise to those who do not receive it the Kingdom works not as redemption but as self-frustration.

The idea of building the Kingdom comes out of idealism—the Kingdom of God is an ideal. This idea is deeply embedded in our modern Christian thinking and must be rooted out at all costs if we are to make progress. A recent author speaks of “the Ideal, call it the Kingdom of God if you like.” If the Kingdom of God is an ideal, then it is something we have to try “to live up to.” Religion becomes a straining toward something outside of one-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

self, something for which we are more or less badly fitted. We have to live against nature. But if the Kingdom of God is existent, is built into the structure of our being, is the only way nature will work, then we are not straining after an ideal but obeying a present fact, and in obeying, finding the way to live, finding life.

The Kingdom of God is not an ideal for which we are to strive and for which we are not made. The Kingdom of God is our nature—our real nature, the way we are made to work. The laws of the Kingdom are the very laws of our own being. When we try to live against the Kingdom of God, we try to live against ourselves, to live against nature. The result? We perish.

I saw a little girl of eight years pathetically trying to win against a slot machine on board ship. She had lost eight dollars on it that day and was dismayed and well-nigh in tears. I stepped up to her and said: "Don't you know you can't beat this machine? It is made in its inner structure to beat you. They have figured it all out by the law of averages and built that knowledge into this machine. If you and others play it long enough, you are bound to lose. Each night the owners empty the machine of its swindlings. And every night it is full and the people who play it are empty. It is made in its inner structure to beat you." She had thought it a fair game and that luck was merely against her.

This crudely illustrates how we try to work against the structure of our being and get away with it. It can't be done. "Thou shalt not surely die," said the serpent in the Eden story. But something did die in them, and something does die within us when we disobey the laws of the Kingdom within. Sin is an attempt to live against the laws of your own being and get away with it. The long history of mankind written in blood and tears tells one thing and one thing alone! It can't be done—the soul that sinneth does die. Here and now it dies—the bloom of life withers, something inwardly snaps, the machinery of life tries to work against itself and succeeds in destroying itself.

It is true that we have introduced into nature a false nature—

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

sin. Sin is not natural, else when we commit it we would feel inwardly fulfilled, at home with ourselves and with the universe. But do we? On the contrary, we feel ill at ease, estranged, inwardly outraged. This shows it is not natural—the thing for which nature is made. Sin, I repeat, is an attempt to live against the laws of your being, which are the laws of God, and get away with it. It is literally “missing the mark,” missing the thing for which you are made, an attempt to make yourself do something for which you are not made. It is like taking out your eye and using it as a ball bearing.

When Jesus defined salvation, He defined it as health. Whenever He used the words, “Be saved,” it is literally in the margin, “Be whole.” Salvation is wholeness, health. There are four unhealthy things introduced into life—sin, error, disease, and death. Sin is the unhealth of the soul, error is the unhealth of the mind, disease is the unhealth of the body, and death is the unhealth of the total person. Carry this thought further and apply it to specific relationships and you will find that injustice is the unhealth of the human relationships; inequality of opportunity is the unhealth of a social organism; greed is the unhealth of corporate life. All of these are sand in the machinery of life. Now, Jesus came to give men life and to give it abundantly. Therefore He came to take away these four unnatural things—came to replace sin with goodness, error with truth, disease with health, and death with life. But goodness, truth, health, and life are manifestations of the Kingdom of God—the Kingdom of God functioning within us, making us natural, making us healthy. We are no longer “missing the mark,” we are “hitting the mark.” We find that life will work in God’s way and in no other.

CHAPTER IV

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

THE ASSUMPTION WITH WHICH WE ENDED THE LAST chapter is so great that we must examine it. If it is true, then nothing else matters—this is the central, all-compelling truth of life. If life will work in one way and in no other way, then we would better drop everything else for the time being to discover that way and live by it.

Man needs nothing so much as he needs some master-conception which brings all life into integration and meaning. In the light of that master-conception everything must be seen and related and all life must move on to the accomplishment of that goal. If not, man stumbles on from circumstance to circumstance, a prisoner of the passing moment, seeing nothing beyond the walls of the immediate. He has no horizons and no hopes.

Adler stresses the fact that all living things move, and that every movement must have a goal; so all living things seek a goal. It is impossible to understand a man's behavior and actions unless we know his goal. This "life-style," he says, is comparable to a characteristic refrain in music; and he ends by saying that most of the difficulties and disappointments in a man's life are the logical consequences of mistakes in his life-plans.¹

In one of my books I emphasized the goal of life as being, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." To

¹ *An Introduction to Individual Psychology*.—Dr. R. Dreikurs, pp. 12, 56, 59.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

be like God in character and life—that is the goal of life. This needs correction, for this goal of life was announced within the framework of the master-conception, the Kingdom of God. This framework was thrown around all the statements of the Sermon on the Mount, and everything must be seen in the light of that fact. Otherwise, if this statement about being “perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect” is taken alone, it may mean an individual perfection; but if it is seen in the light of the Kingdom of God, then it becomes a social perfection as well. That heads life toward right relationships and a right social order as well as a right person. Otherwise you will get the Hindu attempt at individual perfection in isolation. The Hindu has no master-conception such as The Kingdom of God. Hence he goes off on the tangent of isolated perfection. I once talked to an ex-High-Court judge, now seated in ashes as a sadhu, having renounced everything to gain freedom. To say that I talked with him needs correction, for he refused to talk to me, asking to be excused, because he said, to have any relations with persons or things disturbed his quest for individual development toward God. Without the framework of an all-embracing social conception, such as the Kingdom of God, this is where one is landed.

Then what should be sought first? Perfection? No, for if you seek for perfection of character, you will not find it. “Seek first the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you”—“all these things,” including perfection of character and personality. The perfection is a by-product of the dedication to something beyond oneself, the Kingdom of God. You have to lose yourself in some master-cause and then you will find yourself again. But center yourself on your perfection and you become, not perfect, but queer. You need the correction, the discipline, the inspiration, the necessity for self-losing that comes from a master-conception and a master-cause.

The aim and goal of life is to be one thing: “Seek first the Kingdom of God.” The Kingdom is to be first and everything else,

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

yes, everything else, is to be secondary and subordinate. If we do that, Jesus says, "All things shall be added unto you." Everything we need for life and development and happiness will be added. And that "everything" includes the material. And not only includes it, but definitely specifies it. But we are seeking other things first, hence life is turning to ashes on our hands through misuse. We feverishly produce for other than Kingdom-of-God motives, and then our goods rot in our warehouses with no motive for distribution; or, when they are distributed, they become the center and source of war in a fierce struggle for markets. We are seeking first the Kingdom of Mammon, and all these things are being subtracted from us. We waste in a few years of war what we have feverishly accumulated, and more: we burden ourselves with debts for generations to come. You cannot live life against God and yourself and get away with it. The flaming tongues of belching cannon firing from their open mouths the burned bread of the people proclaim this fact in eloquent tones. All these things are being subtracted from us, and we shall eat the bitter bread of poverty and ruin because we sought other things first. "All things betray thee which betrayeth Me."

I said above that we need a master-conception which becomes the master-light of all our seeing. We do. Lionel Curtis, in *The Commonwealth of God*, quotes Admiral Mahan as saying that a military leader whose strategy is sound can afford to commit tactical blunders; but no tactical skill will save a military leader whose strategy is wrong. The strategist is the leader who never forgets his main objectives and the ultimate aim of the war.

As a world we have forgotten our strategy, the Kingdom of God, and hence we are fruitlessly dealing with tactics, tinkering here and tinkering there, but it is all a vicious circle, a dog following his own tail round and round, with no goal and no meaning. Our light has turned to darkness, for we have no master-light which illuminates everything. It is all very like an architect who wants to build a world-building but doesn't know what kind of a build-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ing he wants to build, has no plan whatever, beyond the immediate tactics of fighting with other architects for the materials with which the building is to be built. When he gets the materials, he won't know what to do with them, beyond piling them up, for he has no plan. Man, through science, has gained knowledge of the minute, but has no wisdom regarding ultimate goals. Sir Josiah Stamp, whose main business in life is directing a vast mechanized system, has said that it would not matter if no important discovery in the region of physical science is made for the next twenty years. The American Association of Engineers solemnly debated the question of whether the best contribution the Association could make would be to have the Patent Office of the United States Government closed for a hundred years. Why? Because we do not know what to do with what we have. Since our central conception of life is wrong, we use the materials of life all wrong. The whole process ends in stultification, a running into roads with dead ends. In mathematics when you start with a wrong assumption such as two and two do not make four but five, then all your mathematical propositions come out wrong. Our whole scientific process is coming out wrong—ending in riches and poverty alongside of each other, ending in wars over what we produce by scientific methods, and, worse, ending in science being employed as the agent of the mutual destruction. Never was there such a prostitution of a good thing to a wrong end. And it is all for the lack of a goal and the collective will to move on to that goal. Obviously, the goal is the Kingdom of God. Having lost that, we have lost everything besides.

But when we talk about the Kingdom of God as a goal and a master-conception, there is a subtle danger. We may fall back into the thought of idealism—the Kingdom is a distant goal, and only a conception, albeit a master-conception. This has sapped the very life of the Kingdom proposal. The Kingdom is a goal and it is a conception, but only as far as we are concerned. The Kingdom in itself is not a conception, but a fact. Jesus never presented

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

the Kingdom as a conception—that would have left it in the realm of idea. He presented it as a fact—a fact that had to be acted on—that left it in the realm of realism.

Prayer gathers up our highest and most sacred and most real moments. Jesus put at the center of the prayer which He taught His disciples this petition: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." He put it at the center of this prayer, for it was at the center of His purpose, and He wanted it to be at the center of theirs. When a purpose gets into your prayer, gets into your inmost petition, your most sacred moment, it is getting somewhere. So Jesus built the whole Prayer around that single petition—everything that follows flows from it—bread, forgiveness, deliverance, all come when the Kingdom is operative. This centrality of the petition in the Prayer is in keeping with the rest of His teaching, for the Kingdom was central in all He said and did. Contrast the place of the Kingdom in this Prayer with the place it occupies in the Creeds. The three great historic creeds mention the Kingdom but once, and that marginally, beyond the borders of this life after the resurrection—a heavenly Kingdom. It was not the organizing fact around which everything revolved, as in the Prayer. Hence the difference in the whole outlook of the two. The Creeds begin, "I believe;" the Prayer begins, "Our Father"—the one, "I," the other, "Our"; one is individualistic, the other is social through and through. The individual is to find himself by losing himself in a social whole. The social note is maintained throughout: "Our Father . . . give us . . . forgive us . . . lead us . . . deliver us." It is all "our" and "us." You could not present anything else if the Kingdom, God's new Society, is the spring from which everything flows. It is bound to end in "our" and not in "I."

Now, in this Prayer the Kingdom is mentioned twice and seemingly in a contradictory way: "Thy kingdom come." . . . "Thine is the kingdom." One says, "May He rule," the other says, "He is ruling"—"Thine is the kingdom," not "Thine *will be* the king-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

dom.” Are these two things contradictory or expressing two sides of one fact?

The Kingdom is future—it has not fully come. Man has not accepted it collectively or individually on a wide scale. So we must pray that it may come; but that fact must not push it into the realm of idea, and future idea at that. He corrects that by saying in effect, “While the Kingdom is to come, you must remember it is already here: you must make terms with it—*Thine is the kingdom.*” The Kingdom, then, is not an idea—it is fact, a present, pressing, all-demanding Fact. God has never abdicated. If men do not obey His Kingdom, it doesn’t mean the Kingdom isn’t there. If men refuse to obey the law of gravitation and break their own necks in the process, the law is still there. It is not broken. Only the men are broken. The Kingdom is here and men are breaking themselves in the process of attempting to break the Kingdom. In spite of it all, “*Thine is the kingdom.*” When Judas sold Jesus and His Kingdom for thirty pieces of silver, he did not sell the Kingdom, he sold himself, destroying himself in the process.

“Still, as of old,

Man by himself is priced;
For thirty pieces Judas sold
Himself, not Christ.”

The Kingdom is “at our doors,” it awaits our acceptance. The free agency of man can decide whether it will or will not accept the Kingdom and live by it. Man can make that decision; but he cannot decide the consequences of that decision—that is not in his hands. It is in the hands of the Kingdom. For the Kingdom remains ultimate Fact and has the ultimate word. Jesus said, “Everyone who falls on this stone shall be broken.” Men fall on the Stone to break the Stone and only break themselves. They are free to fall on the Stone but not free to escape the consequences. The Kingdom is at our doors, quietly and unobtrusively awaiting

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

whether we will open the latch to let it in and let it rule. But the words "quietly and unobtrusively" must not obscure the fact that Destiny stands there. "If you had known the hour of your Visitation," said Jesus to a nation that had left the Kingdom at the door and had allowed something else to rule within. But that Visitation unheeded was their damnation. Yes, the Kingdom is at our doors awaiting our choice. It is future.

But the Kingdom is not only at our doors, it is within us. "The kingdom of God is within you." We have usually made this synonymous with the new birth—those who have undergone the new birth have the Kingdom within them. There is no doubt that those who undergo the new birth have realized the Kingdom in a way lacking to those who do not undergo it. They have burst into a new world and a new world has burst into them. Nothing that I shall say should minimize the necessity of the new birth. Until we find it we really do not "see" the Kingdom of God. But whether we "see" it or not, the Kingdom of God is there. Jesus here was not talking to or about regenerated men when He said, "The kingdom of God is within you." The passage reads: "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, . . . The kingdom of God is within you." And then the account adds in the next verse, "And he said unto his disciples, the days will come . . ." (Luke 17. 20-22). When He said, "The kingdom of God is within you," He was talking not to His disciples, but to the Pharisees. And yet the Pharisees were rejecting that Kingdom. Was it still within them? Yes! It is in all of us—good, bad, and indifferent. It is in the very laws of our being, for the laws of our being are the laws of the Kingdom of God. The laws of the Kingdom of God are written not merely in the Sacred Book, they are written within us, in the very constitution of our being. As someone has said: "The will of God is not something other than, or opposed to your real nature. It is your real nature." In making you God stamped those laws in your mental

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and physical and spiritual and sociological make-up. They are a part of you, they are the way life works. If you obey them, you live; if you don't, you die. But they are within you. The will of God, then, is not something that meets us at intervals, as something imposed on us to which we must meekly submit or God will punish us from without; it is something inherent in us, and when we go against it, we go against our very selves.

A supposed saying of Jesus found on a piece of papyrus is as follows: "Raise the stone and thou shalt find Me, cleave the wood and I am there." Yes, and look into the constitution of your own being and you will find the Kingdom of God written. Moreover, look within the sociological laws of human relationships and the Kingdom is written there too.

When Tertullian said that "the soul is naturally Christian," we thought for a long time that this referred only to the soul—that the body and mind were naturally pagan, but we are discovering that the mind and the body and human society are also naturally Christian, that they are unnaturally something else. When sin and evil come in, it is an attempt to live against nature, and the end is self-stultification and ruin. Tillich, objecting to Tertullian's statement, said that "the soul is naturally pagan," while Doctor Horton is for a compromise, saying, "the soul is naturally half-pagan and half-Christian." I am with Tertullian, for when the soul is pagan or half-pagan it is unnatural, it is trying to live against itself. It doesn't succeed. Therefore paganism, which is living without God, is unnatural. This trying to live against oneself, which is what sin is, is obviously unnatural. Sin is an imposition, an intrusion, it is like sand in the eye, like acid on a nerve. It is something for which we are not made. When the soul "comes to itself," it is Christian.

When a very able Christian says that "the teaching of Jesus was anthropology," obviously he did not mean that Jesus was teaching anthropology as the schools do, but that He was lifting up the great underlying principles and facts of life and thus

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

showing men how to live—and illustrating it all in His own person and life. It *was* anthropology, the science of man. And if modern anthropology would learn His wisdom about man and add it to their knowledge of man, we should get somewhere. For an ounce of His wisdom is worth a ton of knowledge, which is often only an accumulation of facts.

One of the most oft-quoted verses from the ancients is that of Augustine: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and we are restless until we rest in Thee." And this saying is destined to be quoted more often in the future as the truth underlying it grips us: we are made by God for God, and as we find and obey the will of God we find ourselves. That is the whole meaning of life compressed in a sentence. That is the inscription written on the cornerstone of the universe, and we are slowly but surely deciphering it. Just as when we found the Rosetta Stone as the key to the undeciphered writings of the past, so when we found Jesus we found in Him the Rosetta Stone—the key to that which was written in ourselves.

Do not misunderstand me—I am not teaching a pantheism, for in pantheism God is the all and that all must include human sin or explain it away. Nor am I teaching a rosy view of human nature which takes no account of the depravity and sin of man. On the contrary, I am insisting that sin is a fact—a terrible and tragic fact, and it is not a mere negative fact—it is positive and real. But sin is not natural or life would grow and develop under it. On the contrary, life goes to pieces under it, the life forces break down and are destroyed. Therefore sin is unnatural, it is an imposition, it has the same function in life as a foreign body does when it is introduced into the tissues—it causes inflammation, infection, and if not got rid of, then death.

When Jesus spoke to the hating, raging Saul on the Damascus road, He said to him: "Why are you persecuting Me? It is hard for you to kick against the goad"—the figure of the ox kicking against the sharp-pointed ox-goad and only hurting itself. Jesus

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

was saying in effect: "I am identified with the Kingdom of God within you. When you kick against me you kick against yourself. I am being persecuted, but you, you are—perishing"! And he was. For the end of the road for him was a blinded, helpless man. He broke himself on the supreme fact of life—Christ.

As I sit writing in these Himalayan fastnesses, I am reminded of the time when a forest fire raged amid the dry underbrush. One of the men who was fighting the fire found a panic-stricken baby deer and took it up in his arms to save it from the flames. But the terror-stricken deer struggled to get free, leaped out of his arms into the fire and in a few moments was burned to a crisp. Out of his arms into the fire! That is the history of humanity. When we leap out of the arms of God, do we leap into freedom? Not into freedom, but into the fire. When we struggle out of the arms of God into our own self-will we do not find freedom but simply the freedom to destroy ourselves. Our freedom is in the will of God and in no place else. Challenge that and you fly in the face of all history, individual and collective.

In the ruins of Babylon I picked up a little delicate flower, the only living thing in that vast waste. As I looked at its lovely delicacy, I said, "How is it, little frail flower, that you, so frail that I could crush you between my fingers, have survived and this vast empire founded on military might has perished?" The flower seemed to smile back at me and to say: "I obeyed the laws of God written in myself—I lived. They disobeyed those laws of God written in themselves—they perished." And the little flower spoke the eternal truth of God, and a solemn "Amen" echoed among the ruins.

Jesus said an astonishing thing when He said, "He that gathereth not with me, scattereth"—if you do not gather with Jesus, if you do not bind things together into obedience to Him, then you scatter; the life forces break down and go to pieces, life perishes because it has no cohesion, no integration; the centrifugal tendencies of evil make life fly apart and perish through

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

division. Men destroy themselves by not living according to their own nature.

On the other hand there is this penetrating word: "He that doeth the will of God abideth forever." He has linked himself with the one abiding fact of the universe, the will of God, and he abides with that abiding fact. The rest perish.

There are many who are troubled about eternal damnation, an eternal hell. And no wonder! The idea of people consciously writhing in the flames of an eternal hell forever and forever is abhorrent, morally abhorrent. How can a good God allow that? But when the gospel says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life," I can understand that and morally approve it. Those who believe in and obey Christ, believe in and obey the laws of the Kingdom of God written in their own constitution—they therefore have eternal life, for they are indissolubly identified with an eternal fact. But those who do not obey the laws of their own being simply do what the verse says—they "perish," eternally perish. They have proved themselves unfit to survive. Just as in the onward march of nature many species perished because they could not correspond to environment, so the species called man is confronted with the necessity of corresponding with the ultimate environment, the Kingdom of God. That environment is all-enveloping, written both within himself and in the constitution of the universe, and if man corresponds to it, obeys it, and lives by it, then he survives. Otherwise, he deems himself unfit to live. He perishes. God doesn't damn him—he damns himself. The valley of Hinnom, or Gehenna, was the place where the waste products were burned. That is what hell is—it is the fact of self-destruction, the place where people burn up the powers of life in the fires of impossible living—so they perish.

When Jesus spoke with choking voice of Judas as the "son of perdition," the word literally is "son of waste," or "that wasted

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

son." He saw the process of self-destruction going on in the inner decay of Judas. But Jesus was not damning him. He was damning himself.

Is this something strange introduced into life, or is it what we find now at work in life? Is evil self-destructive? Is it self-suicide? Said a certain man as he looked on the face of another, "If that man is not a bad man, then God writes an illegible hand." What was written on the face of that man? Corruption and decay—the outer sign of an inner fact. On the other hand, it is no mere chance that those who do the will of God, have peace and poise and assurance written on their faces—also the sign of an inner fact. Life is integrated, a whole—it lives, and it lives forever.

I was talking to a prominent politician who was going through a deep moral struggle—the question of whether he would cease being untrue to his marriage bonds and would break the liaison which he had with another woman. To turn the edge of my appeal to him, he quoted a General who, piqued at the challenge of the Oxford Group, said that he was "going to organize another 'group movement,' and that the principles would be: Absolute Dishonesty, Absolute Impurity, Absolute Selfishness, Absolute Hate." He thought it a good joke. "But," I replied, "if evil is a good thing, as you seem to think it to be by holding on to it, why not go in for it? Why not go in for it to the limit? Sin with all the stops out. Go in for absolute dishonesty, absolute impurity, absolute selfishness, absolute hate." "Oh, no," he replied, very thoughtfully, "we couldn't have *absolute* dishonesty, *absolute* impurity, *absolute* selfishness, *absolute* hate—that wouldn't do." "But why not? If evil is good, then let us commit it unreservedly." Shrewd politician that he was, he saw that you couldn't hold any society together on the basis of absolute dishonesty, absolute impurity, absolute selfishness, absolute hate. That kind of society wouldn't hold together twenty-four hours. It would break down through its own corruption and its own

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

centrifugal forces. Why did Bertrand Russell say that "politics was invented by a grinning devil"? For the simple reason that politics is usually based on self-interest, and the principle of self-interest introduced into life is self-stultifying; you cannot run society on the principle of self-interest. Unless there is another interest running through it, it won't float. It sinks. So my politician friend shrewdly wanted enough honesty, purity, unselfishness, and love in life to keep it going. But he wasn't prepared to make them absolute. He wanted the best of both worlds and missed both. His unhappiness attested that fact.

Three men were debating as to whose occupation was the oldest. The surgeon said, "Mine is the oldest, for a surgical operation was performed in the Garden of Eden when a rib was taken out of the side of Adam." The architect spoke up and said, "No, mine is the oldest, for we built order out of chaos." "No," said the politician, "mine is the oldest, for we created chaos." There is a sting in that joke. Just why does the politician very often create chaos? And why does he do it when he is often a very earnest and sincere man? The reason is that the public life is founded on so-called enlightened self-interest. So the politician creates chaos to the degree that he acts on self-interest, for life founded on self-interest is self-destructive.

When the politician does not rise above self-interest and think of the good of the whole, he creates confusion and chaos. He runs against the laws of altruism and breaks himself and the situation on it. Hence chaos.

All this runs us straight into the second commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." It was genius to pick out of the mass of moral injunctions just two and base the whole duty of man on just these two—love to God and love to man. After two thousand years of human progress have we found two better principles? I challenge any man anywhere to find me two better. It cannot be done. One day I said to a colleague: "Write another Lord's Prayer." How preposterous it seemed! It couldn't be

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

done. What I meant was to write another Hindi paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer. That could be done; but the other could not. For here you have struck an ultimate in prayers, just as you have struck an ultimate in commandments when you meet these two—these two which are one. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart"—the affectional nature; "with all thy mind"—the intellectual nature; "with all thy soul"—the volitional nature; "and with all thy strength"—the physical nature. The whole man—intellect, feeling, will, and the physical—were to do the highest thing in life, to love, and to love the highest being in life, God. There is nothing beyond that. It stands as perfect in first commandments as Phidias stands perfect in art. "Beyond Phidias art does not go," and beyond the choice of this commandment choice does not go. It is inherent in human nature to need something supreme which it can supremely love. That supreme love of the supreme Person gives meaning, goal, and integration to life. Without it life is opportunist, unstable, and uncertain. But the second commandment is just as ultimate on the manward side. It is "like unto" the first—that is, they are not two commandments, but two sides of one commandment: "Thou shalt love." Love to God and love to man are not different, but one. To love God is to love man, and to love man is to love God. They are inextricably bound up. And what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

Is there any other possible way to get along with your neighbor except to love him, and is there any other possible way to love him except to love him as you love yourself? While in South Africa I noticed over the basins of the bathrooms of the railway carriages a sign which read, "Please leave this basin in the condition in which you would like to find it." In other words, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you," or, "Love your neighbor as you love yourself." "Ah," I said to myself, "you cannot keep a bathroom clean unless you apply the second commandment to it. Then how can you keep any situation clean

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

unless you apply that same commandment?" When I stepped out of the train, I was met by reporters who said, "Have you any message for South Africa and her problems?" "Yes," I said, in substance, "if you will apply the principle of keeping that bathroom clean to your South African Union, your problems will be solved. You must love your neighbor as yourself, and your neighbor is the African. Give him the same opportunity as you give yourself and you and he will both rise and you will have a united nation. Refuse it and you will have a divided nation, with two million whites on one side, and on the other six million blacks, flanked in the rear by a hundred million more. You will have to sit in terror at the rise of the blacks in education and in culture, for within the basis of that education and culture you will have implanted resentment, and that resentment will make you afraid—and rightly so. You have created your own fears. You are driving a wedge into your national life—a wedge that may be your undoing. Moreover, you are preparing your own degradation, for by keeping the black man degraded you keep yourself degraded in the process; for, as Booker T. Washington said, 'There is no way to keep a man in the gutter except to stay down there with him.' If you do not love your neighbor, you will be degraded by that very lack of love. Moreover, if you do not love your neighbor as a person he will come back to you as a problem."

The New Zealander applied in large measure this principle of loving your neighbor as yourself to the Maori. A bishop and a governor collaborated in laying the economic foundations of the Maori race when they drew up a bill making it impossible for the Maori to alienate his land to the white man. A basic justice was inserted, the New Zealander loved his neighbor as he loved himself. The result? Today they are a united people, both races are rising, and New Zealand is one of the most civilized portions of our globe. Don't tell me there is a difference in the two races—the Maori and the African, that one can be respected and the other cannot. For if the white man had taken the land

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of the Maoris and left them economically degraded and dependent and unable to buy the means of education and culture, there would have been the same despising of the Maori as there is the present despising of the African. We despise those whom we wrong, and we wrong those whom we despise—a vicious circle is set up and life gets messed and muddled. Why? We are breaking ourselves upon the second commandment.

General Hertzog, of South Africa, said in the midst of the debate on the race question, "We must not only think of our Christian duty, but also of the law of self-preservation." He thought they were two things, and when he said it, he laid bare the central skepticism of today: Christian duty is idealism and the law of self-preservation is realism. No profounder blunder is being made in human affairs. And that blunder is costing us dearly. It is working its devastating way into human affairs and leaving a trail of misery and confusion.

This is vividly seen in the refusal of Woodrow Wilson and Lord Cecil to accede to the Japanese request that a statement, affirming the equality and hence the necessity for equal treatment of all races, be inserted in the League Covenant. Wilson, so great in many ways, made the mistake of his life when he refused the insertion with this statement: "It will raise the race question throughout the world." The fact is that the race question was already raised throughout the world and was crying to high heaven for settlement. The acknowledgment of the equality and the consequent equal treatment of all races would have helped settle it. But we made the great refusal of the second commandment. The result? A friend of mine who lived in Japan said to me: "From the moment this refusal was made, the attitude of the Japanese changed. This became the attitude: 'You say we are not as good as you are? We will show you that we are better.'" Almost from that moment Japan began her present megalomaniac self-assertiveness—a self-assertiveness that has plunged the East into war and has driven China to her cruci-

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

fixion. I do not excuse this rape of China nor explain away the guilt of it, but in that guilt we must all take a share. For we refused to love our neighbor as we loved ourselves, and as a result we are all corporately suffering. We broke the law and it is breaking us.

We broke the law at the close of the Great War of 1914. We could have made a new world if we had been Christian enough and had applied this simple law of the Kingdom. All the strings were in our hands. At the close of the Napoleonic War, the Duke of Wellington stood so high in the estimation of the British people that they said, "You make the peace. It is in your hands." The Iron Duke replied, "If the peace is in my hands, then the first principle of that peace shall be that France shall live." That outlook and determination laid the foundations of friendship between these two great democracies. Contrary to this, at the close of the Great War the one thought and determination was not that Germany should live, but that Germany should be crushed. When Wilson raised another voice, the voice of the Kingdom, Clemenceau sneered and said, "Oh, Wilson talks like Jesus Christ." They would have none of that. They would not love their neighbor as they loved themselves. The result? Out of that attempt to crush our neighbor was born the resentments that have produced the megalomaniac Hitler—and Hitler has produced this present senseless war. We are all corporately guilty. When General Smuts signed the Versailles Treaty under duress, he was heard to say as he went away, "They do not know how to treat a fallen foe." Smuts knew the meaning of how to treat a fallen foe, for he was won over to the conquerors by the way the British treated the South African at the close of the Boer War. They were given an equal place in the Family of Nations of the British Commonwealth, and self-government meant that the South African Dutch, being in the majority, would have ascendancy over the British in the internal affairs of the nation. But we did not do that at the close of the Great War. Hence this mess we are now in. Had

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

we said, at the close of the war, "We have fought and we have been fools together. Now let us be Christians. We will help you reconstruct your country and you can help us to restore ours if you will. We will give back your colonies and do away with the basic injustices and inequalities of raw materials that make for resentments and wars"—had we done that, does anyone in his senses believe that we would be where we are now? We followed what we thought was the realism of Clemenceau, and it turned out to be not realism, but black idealism—unworkable, disruptive, and a breeder of war. Realism, stark realism, would have been to love our neighbor as we love ourselves.

When Sweden and Norway were about to fight over the impending separation of Norway, the Christian realism of the Royal Pair of Sweden decided that there would be no war, that Norway should be allowed to be free—they would love their neighbors as themselves. The result? These two nations became, to all intents and purposes, one—bound together in indissoluble ties, and Scandinavia became one of the most civilized portions of the earth. It was Christian realism that laid these foundations.

A little piece of paper, not much bigger than one's hand, contains the treaty between the United States and Canada, in which it is pledged that the boundary between these two countries shall not be militarized, and that good will and just treatment of each other shall be the defense. The result? Not a fort or a gun or a soldier on three thousand miles of boundary line—and it is the safest international boundary line in the world! If anyone should talk about going to war with Canada, we should look upon him as a dangerous lunatic. I went across the boundary line some time ago, and the Canadian Customs inspector asked how long I was staying in Canada. When I told him he said, "Well, have a good time." I could have hugged him! Saying that on an international boundary line! It just isn't done! But—and this is the point—the attitude involved in all that is realism—sheer realism. It works.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

At a period of tension between Chile and Argentina it was suggested by a woman—bless her!—that the cannon of the two countries be melted and made into a statue of Christ—the Christ of the Andes—with this inscription on it: “Sooner shall these mountains crumble than that this pact of peace, entered into at the feet of Christ between these two nations, shall be broken.” It was done. But the whole thing came near breaking down over the fact that the statue of Christ was facing toward Argentina. The tension was great, when someone suggested that this facing in that direction was proper, “for Argentina needs watching!” Both nations laughed and the Christ still stands as the guardian of peace. And the pact has never been broken, for each is willing to love his neighbor as he loves himself. The second commandment is the realism underlying the whole thing—and it is realism.

You may break the second commandment, but if you do, then you break yourself in the process. Even the Imperial Bank of India, a hard-boiled institution, is learning that. Said one of their managers to me: “We have found that it doesn’t do to break our creditors. A lot of people go down with them and we go down too—the whole situation is spoiled. So we nurse along a creditor who is in trouble, try to get him on his feet again, and if we can save him we save ourselves too.” I replied, “So the Imperial Bank—of all institutions!—is learning Christian realism!”

When Kruger, the Swedish match king, said, “I cannot work with a man until I have first broken his back,” he laid the foundations for the breaking of his own back. And this happened. He broke his own back when he stumbled over the second commandment.

You need not love your neighbor as you love yourself, but if you don’t, you can’t get along with him. Your relationships break down. They simply won’t work in any other way. Try hating your neighbor, or being indifferent to him. Your relationships? They have all gone awry. To love your neighbor as you love yourself is a forced option like eating. You need not

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

eat, but if you don't eat, you don't live. If you don't love your neighbor as you love yourself, you can't get along with him—it is a forced option. You may take it or leave it, but that is the way to live with your neighbor. There is no alternative.

But there are those who would accept the principle as valid and eternal, but they limit the application of it—they will define their neighbor as one whom they pick and choose. That too won't do. For that too breaks the law just as certainly as a complete rejection does. The Jewish people tried that—they said they would accept the law, but define the neighbor as a Jew. The result was the undoing of the Jewish nation. The Jewish people had within them the most precious message ever entrusted to a people—the Kingdom of God. Had they been true to it, they would today be the moral and spiritual leaders of the world. They refused it. Their neighbor would be a Jew and no one else. So Jesus had to say, "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a nation that shall bring forth the fruits thereof." This they would not do, and the result was that since they would love only Jews, they were loved only by Jews and the rest of the world turned upon them in hate. Of course not all Jews refused; individuals did love their neighbors as they loved themselves, and this apart from race, and those Jews have been the salt of the earth, they have led the world. But the nation as a nation refused the second commandment and broke itself in the process as the agent of the Kingdom of God. Jesus pronounced the nation's doom when He said: "Your house is left unto you desolate;" because you wanted it for yourself now you may take it. They chose a Kingdom of the Jews and refused the Kingdom of God. And that choice was their national damnation—the Kingdom of God was taken away from them.

The same thing happened to the Greek city states. They discovered the democratic principle of "the infinite duty of each to all," and out of that principle produced the most astonishing civilization the world had ever seen. They had the future in their

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

hands. They could have determined the future of Western civilization. For this principle of loving your neighbor as you love yourself, and embodying it in the corporate life, was what the world was looking for. But they fell down by refusing to apply the principle in two directions—to the slaves and to other city states. As Lionel Curtis points out: "Athenian citizens regarded the infinite duty of each to all as propounded by Pericles and Socrates as limited to themselves. In dealing with the other democracies they recognized no right, but the might of the stronger. Their failure to conceive the principle of commonwealth on a national scale accomplished the ruin of Greece. Had the Greeks achieved a national commonwealth and held their own against Rome in the West as they held their own against Persia in the East, history would have followed a different course, and the state of human society would, I believe, be far in advance of what it is now. But they knew not the day of their visitation."¹ They were willing to apply the principle of loving your neighbor as you love yourself to the free Athenian and only to the free Athenian, and refused it for man as man and broke themselves in the process. Athens is a memory instead of a living issue. Both Jerusalem and Athens went the same way—to their doom.

When we come to the modern day and survey the attempts to solve the problems of human relationships, all these modern attempts are, strangely enough, going in one direction—the direction of a larger co-operation. Men are seeing more and more clearly that the competitive principle has run its course. It has made its contribution. It cannot take us any further. At the period of its rise, the *laissez-faire* doctrine was a radicalism, the Red Menace. For it took trade out of the hands of the princes and lords and put it into the hands of the people. It was an extension of the democratic principle. It contributed much—it speeded up production. But while it could produce it could not

¹ *Civitas Dei*, p. 896. Oxford University Press.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

distribute. It had the motive for production—private profit; but didn't have the motive for distribution—public welfare. It could love itself but couldn't love its neighbor as itself. Hence life has laid bare the inadequacy of the system based on it. It is breaking down. A new motive is needed—the co-operative motive. And strange to say, there is a wide-scale attempt to apply that principle, the principle of co-operation in corporate life.

Even Communalism in India is such an attempt. It is an attempt to apply the co-operative principle to the religious community. Hitherto the unit of co-operation within Hinduism was caste—a man co-operated with his caste fellow and with no one else. But now Hindus are attempting to apply the principle to a Hindu as a Hindu, to co-operate as a Hindu society. The same with the Moslem. Hitherto he has co-operated with a member of his Moslem sect, and not with Moslems as a whole. Now the attempt is being made to get Moslems as Moslems to co-operate. The unit of co-operation is the religious community.

Fascism is an attempt to enlarge the principle of co-operation and apply it to the State. Within that State the whole of life is organized so that competition ceases and co-operation takes its place. It is a National Socialism.

Naziism enlarges the principle of co-operation and applies it to the principle of Race. Within the limit of the Blood and Soil the principle of competition ceases and the principle of co-operation operates. It too is a National Socialism.

Marxian Communism enlarges the area of co-operation and applies it on a wider scale than that of either of the above—it applies it to the Class—the Class of the proletariat. Within that class there is co-operation, and the co-operation is thoroughgoing, issuing in Communism. Within the limit of the Class there is unlimited co-operation. But it is limited to the Class. It is true that they say they are on the way to a classless society. But in the meantime it is a Class dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the British Empire there was an attempt in the Ottawa Pact

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

to enlarge the principle of co-operation and to apply it to the Commonwealth of Nations making up the British Empire. Not to all, for India is only on the edges of that co-operation. It is still dominated from without, though hesitant attempts are being made to extend the principle of co-operation to India too. But co-operation is extended in many fields to the white inhabitants of the British Empire. It too is the extension of the principle of co-operation.

If all of these are attempts at enlarging the principle of co-operation, of loving our neighbors as we love ourselves, then why is it that our problems have not been solved? Is there something wrong with the principle? On the contrary, the principle is sound, but the flaw is in the application. We are willing to apply the principle so far and no further. And that limitation lays the foundation for clashes.

If you make the limit of co-operation the religious community, then other religious communities will organize and combine against you and communal clashes will be the order of the day, as in India. If you limit the area of co-operation to the State, as in Fascism, and only to the State, then other States will combine against you, and you will have national clashes, as in Europe. If you confine the limits of co-operation to the Race, as in Nazism, then other races will combine against you and you will have war, as is now happening. If, again, you refuse the principle of co-operation beyond the limits of the Class, as in Bolshevism, then other classes will combine and the foundations of overt class war are laid. If you limit the area of co-operation to the white units of an empire, then there will be clash from two directions—from the excluded areas on the outside and from the excluded colored races on the inside. Here too the foundations for clash are laid.

In all of these the attempt to love one's neighbor as one loves himself is vitiated by the attempt to limit the meaning of "neighbor." That limitation causes it to break down. It is an attempt

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

to live by a half-truth and when the half-truth is put under the test of life, then life finds its weakness and it breaks.

But, you say, the League of Nations was an attempt to apply this principle of co-operation on a world scale in an unlimited fashion; why did it break down? But did the League apply the principle of loving one's neighbor as one loves himself? Hardly. For at the vital place, the national self was left supreme. National sovereignty was not touched. It was a league of Nations and not a league of Peoples. The national self was left intact, and when any decision went against that national self, then the nation simply withdrew from the League. The crux of the failure of the League was to be found in the fact that there was an attempt to apply the principle of loving one's neighbor as one loved himself without any surrender of the national self for the sake of that neighbor. There is no love without surrender. You must lose yourself in the loved one to find it again in a larger fellowship, a larger whole. This the nations refused to do. They went into the League with the national self intact and kept it intact and withdrew when the national self was crossed. So the League collapsed. The nations got in sight of the Promised Land and then drew back through fear. But their getting that far was something—a long step ahead, and it was more than something for us to discover collectively where the trouble lies and in what direction the next step must be taken. The national self must be subordinated to the larger self, the Society of Peoples. It must be lost to be found.

But in what direction does all this point? Does it not point as clearly as the noonday sun to the eternal rightness of the Kingdom principle of loving your neighbor as yourself? And does it not also point to the fact that the goal of humanity is a Human Family under God as Father? "One is your Father, and all ye are brethren." Jesus said a penetrating thing when He said, "He that would be greatest among you shall be the servant of all." Note "the servant of *all*"—not the servant of *some* whom we may

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

choose, but "the servant of *all*"—man as man apart from race and birth and color and class is to be given equal opportunity and to be served as of infinite worth. The one who serves "all" in this sense becomes the greatest of all, for he is obeying the fundamental law of the universe.

When Clarence Streit proposes in *Union Now* the nucleus of fifteen nations who should unite at once on the basis of a common citizenship, a common currency, a common trade opportunity, a common postage and a common defense, he points the way to an ultimate world government as more and more nations come into this Union. The proposal is sound as marking the first step on the way to the goal of a united humanity. It would be sounder if India or China had been included in the original nucleus, for if the neighbor whom we are to love is defined as the white man, then the scheme will break itself as it breaks the second commandment. Lionel Curtis, in *The Commonwealth of God*, comes out to the same conclusion, but not with the same clear proposal as Streit. But they both point in one direction—the World as a Family of God. H. G. Wells has been saying this for a long time, and we thought him a dreamer of vast dreams, but he converges on the same point as the rest—a world government. The world government for which we are feeling is the Kingdom of God.

When we turn back to see the attempts made to get a better order, we find the attempts of Communalism, of Fascism, of Nazism, of Communism, of an Empire of Commonwealths, of the League of Nations, all going in one direction—in the direction of the enlargement of the principle of co-operation. That is the most hopeful sign in this dark hour. All the remedies are only one remedy—co-operation, mutual aid. If the Fascist States still say that struggle is the law of life, and competition is the method of survival, nevertheless within their own units they have been forced to a co-operation, to a National Socialism. All of them are being forced to see that the next great step forward is to

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

co-operate, however haltingly, and however limitedly, they apply it. One road seems open to the human race—co-operate or perish.

Now, obviously, the unit of co-operation in each of these attempts has been too limited. The limitations of co-operation to Religious Community, to State, to Race, to Class, to Empire, to League of Nations must go down and the unit of co-operation must be a man as a man, with no exclusions—with no exclusions except those who exclude themselves. And those who exclude themselves from co-operation finally eliminate themselves through mutual strife. I say that the unit of co-operation must be the man and not the nation. The worth of a human personality is that which Jesus affirmed as the ultimate unit of worthwhileness. Before Him are to be gathered "all the nations," and that judgment of "all the nations" was to be on the basis of what they did to the nation? No, as to what they did to the individual: "I was an hungered and you fed me." "Lord, when saw we thee an hungered?" "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these ye have done it unto me." The individual person was the unit of value. If this be so, then all barriers to co-operation must go down, and there must be co-operation between man as man apart from Religious Community, apart from States, apart from Race, apart from Class, apart from Empires of Commonwealths, apart from Leagues. I say apart from Leagues, for the League of Nations made the Nation the unit of co-operation and this was a fundamental mistake. The man must be the unit.

And when we co-operate with man as man it will be the Kingdom of God, for "in it there is no room for Greek and Jew (racial distinction), circumcised and uncircumcised (religious communal distinction), barbarian, Scythian (cultural distinction), slave or freeman (economic distinction), male or female (sex distinction)" (Galatians 3. 28). Here the barriers are all down everywhere and man as a man is the unit of value and the unit of co-operation.

We are not ready to take that—not yet. But more and more

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

we are seeing that it is not idealism, but realism, and we must take it or perish.

But many an honest soul will lay aside this book at this point with a sigh and say: "It's all very well. We approve it all. But it can't be worked, for it all breaks itself upon the selfishness of man. Man is inherently and fundamentally selfish, and your Kingdom of God breaks itself upon that stubborn fact. The nature of man is against it. Man isn't made that way." This is an honest doubt and must be faced honestly.

I think that we will agree more or less that in the discussion regarding the number of the instincts—the urges, the propensities, the driving forces of man—three have emerged as holding the field: self, sex, and the herd. There are lesser instincts, but these are the main ones and most of the lesser ones can be grouped under these. Those three can be grouped under two main heads: the self-regarding and the other-regarding. The self-instinct is self-regarding, and the herd instinct, which is the social instinct, is other-regarding. The sex instinct is partly self-regarding and partly other-regarding. As Lord Samuel says: "The primary instincts that each brings with him are twofold. We call them egoism and altruism, self-interest and sympathy" (*Belief and Action*, p. 124). This is what scientific investigation reveals to us. Now, what does the Kingdom of God say? It says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor [the other-interest] as thyself [the self-interest]." Both interests are to be fulfilled and equally so, for note the word "as." You are to love yourself "as" you love others and you are to love others "as" you love yourself. An exact balance is to be had between them, and someone has said, "If you can get an exact balance between self-interest and altruism, you have an exact and perfect code of ethical truth." This balances them.

Note that it says that you are to love yourself. There is a widespread feeling that Christianity does not allow one to love himself. As a Christian missionary wrote to me: "Does not the gospel teach us to utterly repudiate the self, to crucify it? How,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

then, are you to love it?" My answer was simple: These two are not contradictory. There is a lower, base, sinful self produced through wrong acts and habits that has to be repudiated and crucified. But this is a false, unnatural self; it is not the real self.

The real self, cleansed of the incubus of this unnatural self, is to be loved and developed. But even this true self has to lose itself in a higher will than its own and then it finds itself again in a larger whole: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2. 20). Here the self is crucified, but "nevertheless I live." . . . "I live" . . . "me."

The self has not been wiped out, it has been cleansed of inward contradictions and clashes, so that now it is intensified, it is found.

The idea that you are not to love yourself has led to the thought that Christianity is a reversal of the will to live, it is the will to die. No profounder mistake can be made. For in the Kingdom of God the will to live is at its maximum. In order to live we know we must live well, so we will to live well. As Spinoza says: "We cannot wish to act well and to live well, without, at the same time, wishing to act and wishing to live; no virtue can be conceived prior to this, the endeavor after self-preservation." The Kingdom of God is the supreme endeavor after self-preservation. And, self-preservation is right. If you did not love yourself, you would not take care of yourself, or develop yourself, or even wash your face! Moreover, as Lord Samuel has pointed out: "By seeking his own health, education, efficiency, by realizing the capacities of his own personality—physical, mental, and spiritual—the individual serves the community also." And then he adds, "For the modern mind, looking at the whole matter afresh, without feeling bound by traditional orthodoxies, sees

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

that morality, if it is to be comprehensive, must allow that egoism, at the proper times and in proper measure, is a right motive, that it is indeed essential to welfare."² Here Lord Samuel feels himself to be announcing some new strange truth with which the "orthodoxies" must disagree, when the fact is that Jesus affirmed the solemn duty of man to love himself as he loves his neighbor, and to love his neighbor as he loved himself. But Lord Samuel himself came in sight of this truth when he adds: "Neither altruism alone nor egoism alone is the right guide, whether for persons as members of a community, or for a people as members of the comity of nations."³ He sees that all the way from the individual to a comity of nations neither altruism alone nor egoism alone will do—they must be blended and balanced; in other words, you must love your neighbor as you love yourself.

Now, suppose a man organizes his life around one instinct, the egoistic,—is he natural, is he trying to live naturally? No, for the other great instinct, the altruistic, is undeveloped, atrophied in the process. The entirely selfish man is the entirely unhappy and discontented man, for he is trying to live unnaturally with a part of his nature, the altruistic, unfulfilled. Hence, the selfish are always fed up with themselves. It works with an almost mathematical precision. On the other hand, to try to live entirely altruistically is also to be unhappy. For those who try it, find their own selves intruding and it makes them miserable and unhappy. They too are trying to live against themselves. This false tension between the two is let down when we see that we are frankly to love ourselves and frankly to love others as we love ourselves. Moreover, when we do love others as we love ourselves, we have a self that we can love, for we have a self that we can respect. It is a great thing to be able to love ourselves and to

² From *Belief and Action*, pp. 126, 127, by Herbert Samuel. Used by special permission of The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

³ *Belief and Action*, p. 202. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

have a self that we enjoy living with, the kind of self we can love.

So, if we love our neighbor as we love ourselves, are we living against nature, or are we truly fulfilling our nature? Obviously, we are truly fulfilling our nature, for both parts of our nature are in operation, both parts are being fulfilled and fulfilled in the proper balance.

Moreover, the sex instinct, which is partly self-regarding and partly other-regarding, is fulfilled if we love our neighbor as we love ourselves. For, on the physical plane, the sex instinct will be held under the law of reverence for the personality of the other, as we reverence ourselves. This will save from promiscuity and from improper indulgence in the marriage relation. And beyond the physical, the sex instinct is sublimated into creative activity, creating new souls, new movements, new hopes, new life. For love is creative, intrinsically and fundamentally so. So if we love our neighbors as we love ourselves, then we are creative—creative both toward ourselves and toward our neighbors.

If we fulfill the second commandment, we fulfill ourselves. We are natural. Everything else is an attempt to live against nature, and, as such, is bound to fail. We need have no fear, then, that the Kingdom of God way is an unnatural way. It is the way we are made to work. The channels for this new order are dug deep within our natures, in the very instincts themselves. The truly Christian man is the truly natural man. By natural, I mean according to nature, the real nature of man. Sin is not natural; it is an unnatural intrusion, though it has become the accustomed. Were sin natural, we would find ourselves when we commit it. On the contrary, when we sin, we feel orphaned, estranged, out of gear with ourselves and the universe. On the other hand, when we do right, we feel universalized—at home with ourselves and the universe. We are therefore made for the right, as the lungs are made for air.

No wonder James calls this "the royal law laid down by scrip-

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS WITHIN YOU

ture, *You must love your neighbor as you love yourself*" (James 2. 8, Moffatt). But why did he call it the "royal law"? The democratic law, yes, for it is the essence of democracy and its basic foundation. But why "the royal law"? Well, if a man loves his neighbor, he rules over his neighbor—his neighbor comes under his sway. The instinct to dominate others is fulfilled. But it is fulfilled in a beneficent way. The kingship is creative and not repressive. Moreover, if the neighbor loves him in return, he also rules over the ruler. Both, then, are kings and both are brothers.

Now, regarding the self that loves, it too becomes kingly. "Love God and do what you like," said Augustine, and he uttered a profound truth when he said it. You are free because you are bound. You are free to rule over others because bound by the law of love. This law of love makes us the servant of others and thus their rulers, for the servant of all becomes the greatest of all.

On the other hand, as Macmurray says: "If you try to subordinate another person to yourself, you become in fact dependent on him. Masters must always depend on their servants. An upper class depends on the working class. 'The capitalists,' said D. H. Lawrence, 'are so helpless unless worked for.' The mother who seeks to keep her child young and dependent on her, denies equality and frustrates the relationship."

In the Kingdom of God you do not set out to dominate—you set out to love and, in the loving of your neighbor as you love yourself, you fulfill the two truths found in kingship and in democracy. You are both a king and a brother, a master and a servant. Not only are you as a person fulfilled, but the two systems of governments—kingship and democracy—are fulfilled in loving your neighbors. And in fulfilling them they are both cleansed.

But note in closing that when we talk about loving our neighbor, we do not mean merely the practice of charity toward him

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

—"Charity carefully iced, in the name of a cautious statistical Christ." Rather we mean the exercise of love working out as fundamental justice in human relationships. For charity without justice is an insult.

Note how, in obeying the Kingdom of God, there was a fulfillment of the instincts of the early disciples: 1. Their work was creative—men were born again, new movements came into being. So the sex urge was satisfied. 2. There was a realization of power over others—they found themselves masterful in human relations because they were servants of human beings. The will to power was satisfied. 3. They had an amazing fellowship—hence the herd instinct was satisfied.

To sum up this chapter: The Kingdom of God is within you—written in the very constitution of your being and written in the laws of your relationships with others.

CHAPTER V

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE

WE HAVE SEEN THAT THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WRITTEN in the magnificent; is it also in the minute? It is written in the relationships of large bodies of men; is it written in the men themselves, in their souls, in their minds, in their bodies?

A prominent surgeon in a large university in America said to me: "I have discovered the Kingdom of God at the point of my scalpel. It is written in the tissues. The right thing is always the healthy thing." Note that he says the Kingdom of God is written not merely in the Scriptures, and not merely in our souls, but written in our very tissues, in the very structure of our being. Here is something that is inescapable. You cannot escape yourself. Note again, "The right thing is always the healthy thing." Do the laws of hygiene and the laws of the Christian faith coincide? Will the doctors and the ministers of religion, as they both become more and more enlightened, soon be saying the same thing? And driving toward the same purpose—healthy, wholesome living?

These clues set me on a quest—the most rewarding of my life—a quest to find the Kingdom written in us. It is there! The evidence is overwhelming. All life is converging on one thing: the Kingdom of God is the way to live.

The *British Medical Journal* gives this dictum: "There is not a tissue in the human body wholly removed from the influence of the spirit." Then it matters much to the tissues as to what the outlook and habits of the spirit are. For they are passed on directly to the tissues and make or mar them.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

In a personal letter Dr. Richard Watersten, R.A.M.C., who has had a great deal of experience in these matters and speaks with authority, writes: "Most medical research is at present concerned with the study of disease germs and processes which are studied in relation to a series of cases, the inference being that in a series individual variations tend to be averaged out. The emphasis is laid on this bacterium, that cancerous process, or that type of inflammation. All, of course, are valuable lines of investigation. The study of the soil in which disease finds a suitable starting place is to me the new outlook in medicine." The soil is the habits of mind, the moral and spiritual condition of the man.

E. A. Strecker, in his book, *Mental Hygiene*, states: "It is not an overstatement to say that fully fifty per cent of the problems of the acute stages of an illness and seventy-five per cent of the difficulties of convalescence have their primary origin not in the body, but in the mind of the patient. Percentages are given variously by various authors, but indicate the practical importance of the psychic component in problems of acute and chronic illness."

Dr. Gordon Douglas Campbell, Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of Chicago, in his booklet, *Visceral Behaviour in Neurosis*, states: "The incidence of 'functional' cases, of neuroses and nervous trouble is increasing. Many prominent observers estimate them as composing as high as sixty and even seventy per cent of all cases coming to practitioners and general clinics."

A famous surgeon told me that ninety per cent of the people who came to him for operations could have been cured without operations if they had had right moral and spiritual attitudes toward life. The diseases would have been headed off—they were largely functional before they became organic. A Scotch doctor says that one half of his patients are ill through moral conditions. A doctor remarked to me: "Ninety per cent of my patients would be well if they found God."

Experiments on animals which have been upset emotionally

RESENTMENTS AND HATE. PRODUCE DISEASE

show that these emotional upsets and frustrations not only affect their physical well-being and health, but their intelligence as well. Tests on rats have demonstrated that they are not able to perform a regular routine nearly as accurately or as quickly, after they have been emotionally upset. Dr. W. P. Elmslie and J. V. Suhren, commenting on this in an article entitled, "Emotions and Their Effects," say: "These tests on animals, particularly animals that react more or less like humans, have now been carried on to the extent that they have conclusively proved that fear, anger, frustration, and other emotional upsets not only cause ill health and changes in bodily tissue, but also affect their thinking ability and intelligence. It is demonstrating more than ever before the terrible effects and consequences of those same emotional upsets on humans."

Psychologists and physicians are saying that the great enemies of the human personality are resentment, fear, self-centeredness, and a sense of guilt. These four things are disruptive to human living. They are sand in the machinery of life. Now, Jesus was always emphasizing the opposite of these four things: love, faith, unselfishness, and moral rightness with God and man.

Take the first—love. He said that its opposite, hate, is murder. Not only murder of the other man but murder of oneself, of one's peace, of one's powers, of one's influence. It was murder all around. So He urged one to agree with his adversary quickly—not to let resentment fester—it was poison. He said that if you do not forgive, then God will not forgive you—He cannot, for the very lack of forgiveness to others will be its own punishment. It is disruptive. Jesus said: "But I tell you, whoever is angry with his brother without cause will be sentenced by God" (Matthew 5. 22, Moffatt). How? In the very inward deterioration, in the inner clash and division caused by anger against the brother. He is sentenced by the moral law within. Jesus told us to love our enemies and to do them good—to have positive good will toward them. It is the only way to get rid of enmity which is far more dangerous

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

than enemies. For inward enmity does you far more harm than any outer enemy can ever do. The most destructive enemy is enmity. It stabs you from within.

Jesus' chief insistence was on love—not on love as a sentimental thing, but love as an attitude of good will which issued in right relationships. Was He right?

He was. For its opposite, hate, is now seen in its destructive nakedness. Hate is poison, not only moral and spiritual poison, but mental and physical poison as well. A mother was suckling her child on her bosom, and while she was doing so, she was filled with resentment and hate toward another. The child dropped dead on her breast—poisoned by the hate which had got into the mother's milk.¹ Extreme case? Perhaps, but a doctor told me that the child of one of his patients invariably got upset and ill when the mother was upset with anger and resentments. It was poisoned by the chemical changes in the mother's milk. Moreover, anger impedes the flow of the mother's milk. Professor Latif, in his investigations, found that only when love in the mother was unimpeded by anger was the flow of the milk normal and abundant. So both the quality and the quantity of the mother's milk were affected by anger. A husband and wife were not getting along well together. Their child was anaemic. When the child was taken off the mother's milk and put on artificial milk, it got well for the mother's milk was found to contain toxic substances. Ill will did it.

But it has also been found that indifference to the suckling child will impede the flow of the mother's milk. If the mother is absorbed in mind by something else, the milk is not as abundant as it will be if she is thinking about the child in positive love. This implies that the human system is so made that ill will or even indifference will affect its proper functioning.

¹ W. P. Newsholme, *Health, Disease, and Integration*, p. 54.

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE

Moreover, the flow of the gastric juices is affected by **anger**. Doctor Ivy, Professor of Physiology, Northwestern Medical School, tells in the *Scientific Monthly*, September, 1933, of Doctor Beaumont, an army surgeon located in northern Michigan, who had as a patient a trapper named Alexis St. Martin. The trapper had been shot in the upper abdomen, a hole being made in the stomach. When the wound healed, the opening in the stomach remained open, so that Doctor Beaumont could look into the stomach and see its lining. Doctor Beaumont found that "in the presence of fear, anger, and whatever disturbed the nervous system, the lining of the stomach lost its healthy appearance and the secretions were greatly decreased or stopped flowing. When the patient was happy the stomach blushed rosy red all over, gastric juice poured down its walls like sweat down a hot skin and the organ went into churning movements to mix the food with gastric secretions. But when the patient was emotionally upset or depressed, no juice was secreted and there were no movements." He also found that when his patient had a quarrel, the movements of the stomach were not normal.

Doctor Ivy gives examples from experiments with dogs. "When a hungry dog smells or tastes meat, gastric juice is formed. This is called psychic secretion. If the dog does not like cats and is shown a cat, a psychic secretion of gastric juice will not occur. If we start a psychic secretion by permitting the dog to taste meat and then show him a cat, the secretion will stop. If we teach the dog to like the cat, then we can show the cat to the dog without stopping the psychic secretion."

Doctor Cannon, Professor of Physiology at Harvard, says: "On another day a cat was brought into the presence of the dog, whereupon the dog flew into a great fury. The cat was soon removed and the dog pacified. Now the dog was again given the sham feeding for five minutes. Although the animal was evidently hungry—for he ate eagerly—there was no secretion worthy

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of mention. Anger had stopped the flow of gastric juice," concludes Doctor Cannon.²

Doctor Cannon adds: "If a child has experienced an outburst of passion, it is well not to urge the taking of nourishment soon afterward."³ Recently Oechsler has reported that in such psychic disturbances which are accompanied by a checking of gastric juice, the secretion of pancreatic juice may also be stopped, and the flow of bile definitely diminished. All the means of bringing about chemical changes in the food may thus be temporarily abolished.

Not only are the digestive juices stopped by anger, but the movements of the stomach as well: "In the cat, therefore, any sign of rage or fear, is accompanied by a total abolition of the movements of the stomach. Even indications of slight anxiety may be attended by a complete absence of churning waves."⁴

It is obvious from the above that anger and resentments are a positive danger to the digestive system and thus a positive danger to health in general. I know a very able lady who when she loses her temper invariably goes to bed ill. Anger upsets her whole system. Doctors tell us of "the threads connecting mental agitation, depression, and anxieties with the numerous disturbances of the organs of circulation, digestion, and sex."

Anger and resentments give rise to positive diseases. At the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, Dr. Stanley Cobb and a staff of clinicians and research workers have been studying patients afflicted with such widely contrasted disorders as asthma, arthritis, and mucous colitis. In each of these groups they found that a large proportion were dominated by anxieties, phobias, and various forms of chronic emotional tension. It was noticed of the colitis group, for example, that only one half of the patients

² W. C. Cannon, *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear, and Rage*, p. 10. D. Appleton-Century Company.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE

actually had diarrhea, but all had abdominal gripes. In personal interviews it came out that ninety-six per cent of them showed resentment, seventy per cent of them expressed feelings of guilt. Conscience was worrying many of them. They were indignant against employers, teachers, and parents and reacted to these antagonisms with their bowels.⁵

But the effect of resentment may not be merely upon the bowels. It may be upon the heart and the arteries as well. Dr. Franz Alexander and Dr. Leon J. Saul, of the Institute of Psychoanalysis in Chicago, told members of the American Association: "If you get angry at the boss and tell him so, you will probably lose your job, but if you stay angry at him for years without boiling over at him, you are probably damaging your arteries and building up a dangerously high blood pressure. Hostility suppressed for years, like a boiling volcano which never erupts, is the fundamental cause of malignant high blood pressure for which no physical cause has ever been found." Measurements taken at psychoanalytic sessions showed that the blood pressure rose when the patient was found by psychiatric analysis to be at the pitch of rebellion and dropped to normal when the patient had a temporary spell of inner calm. These fluctuations, they believe, damage the arteries, narrowing the bore so that the heart must work at constantly greater pressure to drive the blood through.⁶

A famous surgeon told me of a highly intelligent woman who complained of a pain, first in the small of her back, then between her shoulder blades, and then in her neck. The doctor saw that the pain, though real to the woman, was the result of a mental state, so he said to her: "Now, tell me the real basis of your difficulty." Very slowly she said, "Well, I think if just once I could tell my husband to go to hell, I would be all right." She had dammed up resentments against her husband and a temporary explosion might have relieved her of the pains, but, of course, it

⁵ "Anxiety and Illness," George W. Gray, in *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1939.

⁶ *Science Service Release*, June 6, 1938.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

would have been no cure. She had to get rid of the resentments to be cured.

Anger and resentment may produce stomach ulcers as well. Of course not all stomach ulcers are produced through anger and resentments, for there is often a physical basis. But where there is a physical basis the ulcer is often aggravated by resentments and hates. One of the outstanding men in America, an authority on vitamins, told me that stomach ulcers are, in fact, often produced through anger. This was corroborated by a medical friend, who told me of a case which was discharged from the hospital as cured. But a little later the ex-patient became very angry with his son. During that week end of anger the ulcer returned. A doctor told me that his wife had peptic ulcer and that it grew out of emotional disturbance caused by a quarrel with her father.

I was speaking in the Taj Mahal Hotel ballroom in Bombay on this subject and in the midst of my address, a Parsee gentleman arose and interrupted me by asking if he could say a word. I wondered if he were going to try to refute what I was saying, but instead he said: "I want to corroborate everything the speaker is saying. I suffer from a stomach ulcer, and when I get angry the disease is always worse."

At the close of a meeting a lady came up to me and in a frightened voice said: "Well, if anger may produce a stomach ulcer, I'm never going to get angry again." She would not listen when "Thou shalt not hate" was written in the Bible, but she sat up and took notice when she found it was written also in her own stomach.

A doctor told me of a case of a woman who disliked her son-in-law, whom she visited once a year. On each visit she got arthritis and each time she returned home again she got well.

One can see how the cases mentioned above would be caused by anger and resentments, but experiments show that the effects of these two things go much further afield than one had dreamed.

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE

Dr. Flanders Dunbar and her group at the Presbyterian Hospital in New York thought it would be useful to select some types of illness that are generally related to organic impairment and see to what extent emotional disturbances were also represented. They decided to study patients suffering from two widely different kinds of organic disease: (1) Those afflicted with diabetes, and (2) those afflicted with diseases of the heart. A third group was desired to serve as a control, a sort of norm by which to check and compare the other groups, and for this, (3) the choice was fracture cases, that is, patients who had come in with broken bones. Thirteen hundred cases have been studied in this way. In each of the three groups emotional factors were found to affect more than half of the patients. The great surprise came from the control group. They proved to be quite as involved as the others, and it was shown that not only impaired hearts and disturbed glands, but also broken bones may trace their causes to hatreds, fears, and other emotional states.

In case after case an intimate discussion of the experience with the patient showed there was more than accident in the occurrence. To take one from among many. A twenty-nine-year-old servant had been sent by her employer to do some marketing. On the way to the store she slipped, sprained her knee, and thereupon telephoned that she would send a friend to do the housework while she went to a doctor. But her employer said that she must return to the house at once. The servant was "so mad I could have killed her," and in returning fell down again, this time breaking her knee bone. "Now I guess she'll learn how to treat somebody," said the woman to her nurse, and when her employer visited her at the hospital, she repeatedly reminded her, "If you'd just had a little more patience."⁷ In the thirteen hundred cases which had come to the hospital all were organic and not merely functional. What could be more organic, that is,

⁷Quoted by George W. Gray, "Anxiety and Illness," *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1939.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

more an anatomical damage, than a broken bone? And yet they discovered that eighty-five per cent of the persons in this fracture group were marked by long-established anxiety hysterias, and various phobias and resentments.

To say "I feel it in my bones" is no exaggeration. You do. And anger cannot only break fellowship, it can break bones. Life is upset through and through by resentments. Someone asks the question, "Is the gouty colonel irritable because he has gout, or gouty because he is irritable?" The answer is, "Both." Emotion alters metabolism—of that we can be sure—and it may be in some cases this change is set in motion by the mood of the patient. A friend who is an expert counselor tells me that he finds more people upset physically and spiritually by resentments and hates than by sex problems. Very often these resentments are unconscious, but even so they are not less dangerous than the conscious hates.

To get release, then, one must get these resentments up and out and face them frankly. A woman came to me for spiritual help. She had nursed a life-long resentment. In her girlhood she had been wronged by a man. A fierce hatred set in. "For two years I shut myself up in my room and did not speak to anyone during that time. I nursed my hate." Later she went to a psychoanalyst, who told her she must continue to hate, she must not suppress it—a complex would set up if she did. "So I have hated all these years, but it has worn me out. I'm sick of this hating. It is killing me. What do you say?" When I slowly said, "You must replace this hate with love—you must love, have positive good will toward this man, your enemy," she was startled and afraid. How could she change a life attitude? "By God's grace you can," I assured her. She saw this open door, took it, wrote to the man expressing her positive good will and desire to help him out of the hell into which he had got himself. In doing so she became released and happy and is now one of the most useful and radiant persons I know. Hate to her was poison—poisoning her

RESENTMENTS AND HATE PRODUCE DISEASE

soul and her body and her usefulness. Love became food, feeding her soul and her body and her usefulness. Moreover, it sustains her today in a radiant life.

Science has always seen more or less clearly the very close connection between the state of the soul and the state of the body, but now it is becoming more precise in its knowledge of that connection. Doctor Newsholme asks: "Is there much which we call organic disease only functional and based on faulty habits of action in the deeper stratum of the personality and approachable only through that stratum? . . . Why is there this buttressing of the outworks of the body and mind and, on the other hand, the relative neglect of the state of the central citadel of the soul?"⁸ "The state of the central citadel of the soul" is affected profoundly by anger and resentment and that in turn reacts upon the body and cripples it in various ways.

The Kingdom of God and modern science converge on the fact that resentments and hate are disruptive to human personality and to human relationships. Is not modern science simply discovering the laws of the Kingdom of God written in the constitution of man and his relationships? Science is studying a new Bible—the Bible written in man. And that Bible, with its laws written in man is turning out to be strikingly like the Bible of the New Testament.

We have found that when Jesus insists on rising above resentments and hates, He is on the solid ground of realism. Modern hygiene and psychology say the same thing.

Remedy: Get the resentments up and out by confession and by giving forgiveness to the one against whom resentments are held and by asking forgiveness for holding them. By the grace of God you can do it. See Chapter X on the possibility of being so reborn that resentments have no part nor lot in your make-up.

⁸ W. P. Newsholme, *Health, Disease, and Integration*, p. 250.

CHAPTER VI

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

IF LOVE IS FUNDAMENTAL IN JESUS' INTERPRETATION OF the Kingdom, so is faith. Now, faith is not "believing in spite of evidence," nor "believing what you know isn't true," as some have cynically suggested. Rather it is an open-eyed adventurous affirmation that in and through things is a Good Will, and that Good Will is God. Therefore faith relates itself to that Good Will by betting its life on it. It is hope grown convinced and courageous and constructive.

Jesus was always saying that without faith life collapses, but with faith you can remove mountains, you can do anything with yourself and others. Therefore He was always asking men to throw aside fear and take faith. In the midst of a world filled with fears He was constantly saying to all classes of people, "Fear not, only believe." In a world of Nay-saying was Jesus right in this attitude? Is the Yea-saying better than the Nay-saying? Does it work out into better human living? Does it make any difference whether a man lives by fear, rather than by faith?

"Fear is at the basis of my life," said a very brilliant Parsee lady to me, and you could see how disrupted her life was on account of it. A doctor told me of a patient who came to him for snake bite, but he could find no abrasion of the skin, even with a microscope. But because he thought it was a cobra bite, the patient died from sheer fear. The life forces broke down under that fear. In the Honolulu Museum is a statue of a chief prostrate before his god. This chief prayed to the god to kill his enemies, and when his

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

enemies heard he was praying for their death they forthwith died—killed by fear. In Africa very often a man who hears that someone “has pointed a bone” at him will fall down and die, obviously from sheer fear. Only when a witch doctor manufactures something to counteract this pointing of the bone will he survive from the shock of fear.

A doctor told me that two patients were diagnosed the same day; one was pronounced seriously ill with little or no hope for recovery, the other had nothing seriously wrong and would soon recover. These two diagnoses were written out, but by mistake were put into the wrong envelopes. The man who was “hopelessly” ill recovered, and the man who had little the matter with him died—died of fear.

Doctor Dubois tells of the following experiment on a prisoner condemned to death: He was blindfolded and told that the artery of his arm was to be cut and then they (the group of doctors) would observe how long it would take for him to bleed to death. His arm was bandaged tight just below the elbow, then a knife was drawn lightly across the surface of the skin, as though it was being cut, however there was no incision. Water was run slowly through a tube and allowed to drip in a basin under his arm. The doctors kept commenting on his pulse action, stating that he was growing weaker and that he could only last a few minutes longer. The patient believed so confidently what the doctors were saying, that it produced a profound effect on his nervous system which caused his heart to stop beating. He thought he was bleeding to death, so he died of anxiety and fear.

These are dramatic cases with dramatic results, but do fear and anxiety work a more silent havoc in human living? Of the two anxiety is more basic, fears arising out of anxiety. When Jesus said, “Do not worry” (for that is the meaning of, “Be not anxious”), was He simply lifting up a law of human living, so deep rooted that it goes to the roots of life itself? What is the testimony of those who deal with human living?

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

It has been said that "as the nineteenth century brought insight into the nature of contagions, and provided the powerful tools of antiseptics and immunology, so it may be that the great contribution of the twentieth century will be insight into the nature of anxiety states and the attainment of technique for the prevention and control of their ill-effects."¹

"The conditions favorable to proper digestion," says Doctor Cannon, "are wholly abolished when unpleasant feelings such as vexation and worry and anxiety are allowed to prevail." In India the "ordeal of rice" is based on fear inhibiting the flow of saliva. When several persons are suspected of crime, the consecrated rice is given them to chew and after a short time is spit out upon the leaf of a sacred tree. If anyone ejects it dry, that is taken as a proof that fear of being discovered has stopped the secretion and consequently he is adjudged guilty. A speaker who is afraid will probably suffer from a dry mouth. I can remember suffering from dry mouth only once, and that once was when I arose to resign as a bishop!

A father received the news that his favorite daughter, a student in medical college, had given birth to an illegitimate child. The news so shocked him that he went out and began to vomit. The digestive processes stopped from the anxiety. Moreover, his mind went entirely blank regarding the present—he could remember the past, but the present was a blank, and remained so until his death. What had happened was that the mind, unable to bear the strain of the present, passed a hand of forgetfulness over it. He could remember the past because that past held only beautiful memories of his daughter. Anxiety had paralyzed parts of his brain.

A very intelligent woman began to be afraid of life, and began to retreat from it. She lost her nerve. That inner retreat began to show itself in outward manifestation. She began to lose the

¹ George W. Gray, "Anxiety and Illness," *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1939.

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

use of her legs. For years she has been a hopeless cripple, her husband spending about half a million dollars on her. And she is beginning to lose the use of her hands for the same reason. The inner paralysis of spirit was passed on to the body. In response to my urging that she could still get out of her retreat and could still make something of life, she hesitated through fear of giving up her one refuge—her retreat.

The conditions of mental discord may give rise to a sense of gastric inertia. Doctor Muller cites a patient who testified that anxiety was always accompanied by a feeling of weight, as if the food remained in the stomach. McLester has estimated that one third of the patients with disorders of the alimentary tract are suffering because of the lack of emotional balance.² Muller tells of the case of a young woman whose lover had broken off the engagement of marriage. She wept in bitter sorrow for several days, and during that time vomited everything she took. Anxiety had stopped the digestive process.

A young doctor told me he had a quarrel with a fellow medical student and for twenty-four hours he could keep nothing on his stomach—everything was vomited. When he had the burden of anxiety lifted from his mind by reconciliation with his friend, immediately his digestion returned to normal. A lady told the author that she had had colitis for fifteen years, and that it began when she escaped from a burning building with the loss of all her goods. She confessed that she still worried a bit. Hence the disease clings on.

Doctor Dogra, of Madras, in experimenting with monkeys found that when they were brought suddenly into a dark room the process of digestion stopped through fear of the dark. After remaining in the dark room for half an hour and finding there was nothing to fear digestion processes began again.

Doctor Ivy says, "For several years I have observed that when

² *Journal of the American Medical Association*, LXXXIX (1927), p. 1019.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

medical students are given a written examination in physiology, the emptying of their stomach is prolonged an hour or more. . . . Emotion, anxiety, and worry not only affect the movements of the stomach, but also movements of the colon. Certain movements of the colon may be stopped and others increased by worry. Worry and nervous tension generally cause the colon to become more irritable and spastic and produce colitis. You all know that the last part of the colon is under the control of the brain to a very large extent, and good and bad habits may be formed in regard to emptying. . . . Peace of mind and comfort are very important for normal digestion. These facts show that mental discord and worry disturb digestion and may serve as the background for the development of certain diseases of digestion. It is a fact that deaths from gastric ulcer have increased twenty-five per cent among white men since the start of the depression in 1929.”³

Doctors Davies and Wilson, after long investigation, say: “We have drawn attention to the nervous influences which appear to operate in certain personality types in precipitating ulcer symptoms and in determining recurrences. Disturbing situations and events, acting as precipitating factors by causing anxiety to the patients, were found to precede the onset or return of symptoms in eighty-four per cent of two hundred and five patients with peptic ulcer. . . . In haematemesis, or bleeding into the stomach, it was found that of the fifty-five patients examined forty-seven were preceded by some alteration in their lives, a type capable of producing emotional stress. The precipitating events classified themselves most readily in relation to money matters, to the nature of their work, and to serious illness of near relatives, with a small residue of miscellaneous disturbances.”⁴

To support the above they give many illustrations: 1. A man

³ Dr. A. C. Ivy, “The Effect of Worry on Digestion,” *Scientific Monthly*, September, 1933.

⁴ “Personal and Clinical History in Haematemesis and Perforation,” Davies and Wilson, *The Lancet*, September 30, 1939.

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

who said of himself, "I worry a bit," began to have indigestion in 1929 when trade began to fall off. In 1934 he failed in business and had his first "bleeding" a few days afterward. "Whenever things get to a climax this happens. As soon as it is over I'm all right again." 2. A woman had indigestion which became worse when she began worrying about her daughter. Three weeks before her husband's retirement on a pension she had a haematemesis. "My husband's retirement made a big financial difference to us." All sixteen of the fifty patients examined disclosed such stories of money difficulties preceding gastric hemorrhage. 3. One of the patients disclosed that for the first time in his life his good name had been doubted and, to redeem his name in the eyes of his bankers, he had to find the sum of fifteen thousand pounds within a few days. This demand was made to him three days before the hemorrhage. 4. A ship captain tells of being in a position where "any delay in the Straits might result in the total loss of the ship and endless enquiries." He was intensely anxious. The hemorrhage followed on this anxiety. His second hemorrhage took place in similar circumstances. 5. A young woman worried about her added responsibility in a children's home—the matron was on a holiday and the home was under the charge of the only sister in the establishment. This sister was taken ill suddenly, and the young woman found herself in sole charge. The bleeding took place at this time. 6. An accountant went back to work after a brief holiday. On his return he received "the greatest shock of his life" when his partner demanded dissolution of the partnership because he had been away from business too often and too long. Seven days later he suffered a haematemesis. In ten out of eleven cases they showed symptoms of some increase of long-standing emotional stress in the period preceding the hemorrhage. In peptic ulcers perforation was preceded in sixteen cases out of twenty-five by some outstanding event which produced acute emotional stress and worry. 7. In one case a housewife had never had any indigestion until the day after the funeral of her husband.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

On the second day after the funeral she "perforated." In summing up the discussion these investigators say: "Tension produced by uncertainty in work and relating to money matters commonly dominates the picture, but illness of a member of the family or of the patient himself, played a part in some instances. . . . In our medical attempts at prevention by far the most important point, we consider, is to facilitate the conviction of the patient that his mind is capable of bringing distress to his stomach. To the lay person the mind is often something encased in the head, far removed from the stomach." Their intimate connection is now a proved fact.

Drs. Bela Mittelman, of New York Post Graduate Hospital, and Harold S. Wolf, of Cornell University Medical School, report that in a state of worrying, hydrochloric acid, the normal digestive juice, is sometimes more than doubled. This excess of acid produces stomach ulcers. The physicians measured the acid changes by a fine rubber tube running down via the nose into the stomach while the patients talked about their troubles. One man was worrying because a fellow worker had died unexpectedly and he had an obsession of fear of the same fate. His stomach trouble had started after this worry began and after he had tried to conceal it from everyone, even his wife.

Another stomach victim showed the rushes of acid when he told how his wife dominated him.

Another man who had been a successful broker and church worker, but who had an affair with a servant girl, appeared with duodenal ulcer. His home life was unhappy. His character was diagnosed as one who craves approval. He too had high acid during worry. Outbursts of anger, resentment, and indignation caused the high acidity.

One sufferer even got the extra acid when sound asleep, but dreaming of his troubles.

But not only do worry and fear bring diseases of the alimentary canal, they also produce arthritis. The evidence is overwhelming

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

that this is true of many cases, not of all cases, of course, but certainly of many cases. Many of these cases are to be classed as functional arthritis, but they have all the symptoms of organic arthritis. A very intelligent friend told me that she was given the shocking news by the doctor that her mother had cancer. Worry and intense anxiety set in. The next morning her fingers and knee joints were stiff with arthritis. The doctor treated her for some time with no benefit. Then the mother was again examined and it was found that she did not have cancer. The daughter's arthritis disappeared immediately, and it has never returned.

In one of my Round Table Conferences a very radiant Christian missionary said: "I had neuritis. Fear was at the basis of it. I got rid of my fear and the neuritis vanished." Now she has neither fear nor neuritis.

A very good woman who wanted to dominate her family spiritually had arthritis. She was tense with anxiety to do so. A friend got her to surrender her desire to dominate. The arthritis left her and today she is doing her own housework.

Nissen remarks that arthritic reactions must often be regarded as fundamentally purposive, since they provide an easy way for the feeble psychic to avoid the stresses of life.

In the *British Medical Journal*, in an article on "The Psychological Factor in Chronic Rheumatism," Doctor Gordon quotes the work of Swain (1936) as the most striking in this respect. He started with the orthopaedic approach but was compelled to say: "We have been so concerned with the disease picture that we have often overlooked the real cause of functional disturbances which are present. With a closer study of the mental and spiritual defects of a large number of rheumatoid cases I have found deep-rooted fears, worries, resentments to be the basic causes of their ill health. Because of this new spiritual approach to these underlying conflicts I have begun to see that I have been missing a great (possibly the greatest) therapeutic force which we may ever find. I feel that we doctors have a unique opportunity to reach, and

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

meet, people's deepest spiritual needs, which so often result in the functional disturbances which, in turn, are forerunners of organic diseases. Much of the future progress in the art of healing the body will come along lines that recognize and have an answer for the healing of the soul. More people are sick because they are unhappy than unhappy because they are sick."

Later on (1938) associated with Harris, Swain says: "For many years we have believed that rheumatoid arthritis could be controlled only by complete treatment. Therefore after working out an orthopaedic method of preventing deformities we turned to the well-known psychogenic factors. These psychogenic factors have been present in sixty-six per cent of the cases of arthritis coming under the observation of Dr. Stanley Cobb, of Boston. Since unhappy family relationships are responsible for half of these factors, we collected data about reactions to human relationships. We find that the emotional responses of fear, resentments, worries, and inner conflicts are more important than the environmental factors themselves. These negative emotions were the result of personality forces and habits, such as selfishness, self-centeredness, and self-protectiveness. Spiritually the rheumatoid arthritics studied had no vital faith and were therefore fearfully facing life's responsibilities alone. The correlation of these negative reactions with the joint flare-up was astonishing in the two hundred and seventy-five cases under observation. In looking for the answer to the self-centeredness which resulted in fear and resentment, we found the solution begins in the honest facing of themselves with the doctor, and with his aid ends in the development of a vital faith. A deep religious faith is the most effective faith, provided the doctor himself has such a faith to give. Five years of observation has convinced us that just facing these negative attitudes is not enough to overcome them, but with development of a faith fear goes, improved health follows, and, most important of all for the future welfare of the patient, personality changes take place. We find that unless a patient can return to his old environment

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

improved in body, intelligently understanding his adjustment problems, and with a faith which gives confidence in the future, he has no real guarantee of permanent health. All our combined medical and orthopaedic skill is vitally essential to recovery, but because of psychogenic factors found in most rheumatoid arthritics, we fail to prevent recurring attacks unless we develop in the patient himself a power to control his negative emotional reactions. From these observations we are convinced that the control of the psychogenic factors in chronic rheumatoid arthritis lies in the development of vital faith, which will meet those needs with its positive philosophy for living."⁵ The author closes his article with this sentence in reference to rheumatoid arthritis: "Chase out the 'jitterbug' and other bugs won't find it nearly so easy to thrive."

The Jewish doctor at our Ashram in India tells me that after the first lecture to new medical students on appendicitis three or four new cases of appendicitis usually developed among the students themselves. The same thing happened after the first lecture on throat affection—several cases developed among the students. Obviously, in both instances the symptoms were induced by anxiety caused by directing the attention of the students to themselves.

The disruptive effect of anxiety and worry works out into other diseases too. Doctor Cabot (Cabot, *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, Vol. XXVIII, 1925, p. 384) has recorded an instance of the fracture of a leg which failed to unite. Investigation showed that the patient was fearful lest the family was suffering while he was absent at the hospital, so the anxiety resulted in loss of desire for food, this resulted in impaired nutrition, and this in turn led to such impairment of the reparative processes that the bone fragments were not welded together. Doctor Alvarez, of the Mayo Clinic, cites a case of persisting vomiting which started when an income tax collector threatened punishment if a discrepancy in the tax statement was not explained, and which ceased as soon as Alvarez

⁵ Quoted by Doctor Gordon, *British Medical Journal*, June 10, 1939.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

himself went to the collectors, as a therapeutic measure, and straightened out the difficulty.

Doctor Titus tells of a young tailor who, when confronted with a serious moral fault, fell into a fit and vomited. The emotional disturbance had upset his whole nervous system and with it his digestive tract.

"Almost all unpleasurable sensations arising from the heart are accompanied by anxiety," observes Dr. Theodore P. Wolfe, of Columbia University, "and there is no anxiety so overwhelming as that accompanying an attack of angina pectoris." "But," as Doctor Wolfe hastens to add, "anxiety also produces cardiac symptoms." In the early stages of angina pectoris an incautious remark, "You have a slight heart murmur," or, "Your blood pressure is high," may accentuate uneasiness to actual anxiety. Thereupon, experiencing the pain, the victim feels that his anxiety was justified, and so he becomes more anxious, with still more spasms of the blood vessels as a consequence.

Many doctors agree that the establishment of a hopeful attitude is one of the principal treatments in these patients. Dr. Karl Fahrenkamp calls attention to two types of angina pectoris. In one type the attacks usually occur during or immediately after exertion, whereas in the other, the attack comes like a thief in the night, usually during repose, often in sleep. Oppressive fear of death occurs most frequently in the second group, but in all cases, next to physical exertion, emotional excitement is the activator most likely to bring on an attack. "The non-neurotic may retain from his first attack such a degree of fear that he is unable to free himself from a secret anxiety. Even if he does not let others notice his chronic anxiety, or perhaps denies it even to himself, this anxious psychic condition inevitably brings about unfavorable physical changes."

Doctor Cannon says, "During the war there appeared not infrequently cases of 'disorderly action of the heart,' or as it may be called 'soldiers' heart.' The slightest excitement or perturbation

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

would send the pulse bounding at a high rate (130-150 beats per minute). The general physical and nervous conditions of the victims of these disturbances—their anxious faces, their troubled eyes, the drawn lines about the mouth, their trembling—were such as to make the reasonable view that the stresses of the war had become intolerable and had resulted in such sensitizing of the sympathetic control of the heart that even mild stimulation produced extreme effects.”

Doctor Hunter, a famous doctor who had a heart affection, used to say, “My life is in the hands of any scoundrel who would make me angry.”

George W. Gray cites the case of a man in a hospital critically ill with asthma. After weeks of treatment he was relieved and a day set for his discharge. Suddenly on the night before his scheduled departure, all his former dangerous symptoms returned. Treatment was resumed; again his breathing became free; again arrangements were made for the journey. And again the asthma returned in full force. The record showed that this patient was a college teacher who had become embroiled in a faculty fight and feared for his job. Here was a situation of uncertainty such that it became better to remain within the protecting walls of the hospital than to go back to the scene of former strife and face likelihood of dismissal.⁶

In the same article, Gray quotes another hospital case: a man whose arms were pimpled with a bothersome skin disease. “Almost every Monday I have a breaking out like this,” he said. It developed that on Sundays he visited a young lady to whom he had been engaged for years, but the woman repeatedly postponed naming the wedding day. Each Sunday the man pressed for a decision; each Monday was the day after a frustration. And “almost every Monday” his skin protested his anxious state by breaking into eczema.

It has been pointed out that it was perhaps not chance that the

⁶ “Anxiety and Illness,” *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1939.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

great influenza epidemic of 1918 coincided with the most anxious periods of the war. Doctor Saul noticed during psychoanalysis of nine patients that they developed colds in connection with certain emotional situations, and as they gained insight into and relief from their problems, their colds disappeared.

It has been noticed that asthma attacks regularly occur in reactions to situations which seem to threaten the patient with loss of love of some person upon whom he is emotionally dependent. The attacks are most frequent during periods of struggle over a decision whether or not to leave home.

A young Hindu woman had a pain in her back near the kidneys. But one day the doctor found the pain had shifted to the other side. This gave him the clue—the pain was real, but was the result of mental stress. He found she was unhappy with her mother-in-law. She was sent home to her own home out of this distasteful situation, and the pain disappeared. She was not malingering—the pain was real.

Doctor Foster tells of a wife, who was free from any cardiac disorder, who saw her husband walking arm in arm with a strange woman and acting in such a way as to arouse jealousy and suspicion. She then began to fear going out, lest she might meet her husband with her rival. After days of wretchedness she was persuaded by a friend to venture forth, "probably in a state of abject terror," but she had not gone far when she ran back to her home. Then she noted that her heart was thumping hard, that she had a sense of oppression in her chest and a choking sensation. Later attempts to go outdoors produced the same alarming symptoms. She began to feel that she might die in the street if she went out. There was no organic disease of the heart, and yet slight effort as she moved from her home brought acute distress.⁷

Emerson quotes the case of a man who had a quarrel with his fiancée. She pretended to commit suicide, had in his presence

⁷ Quoted by W. B. Cannon, *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear, and Rage*, p. 255. D. Appleton-Century Company.

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

swallowed some pills and fallen down screaming. The man departed hastily. Within a week he was suffering from swelling of the neck and nervousness. When he appeared at the hospital four months later, he presented a large goiter over which a definite thrill could be felt, and his basal metabolism was up twenty-four per cent above the normal level. The writer has just seen a case in a hospital where a mother with the help of another pulled her child out of quicksand into which she was rapidly sinking. From the shock of this fear and anxiety goiter developed.

In cases of mental diseases, also, states of depression are very often accompanied by sugar in the urine. Dr. Schultze has reported that in these cases the amount of glycosuria is dependent on the degree of depression, and that the greatest excretion of sugar occurs in the fear-psychoses. Raimann has reported that in both melancholia and mania the assimilation limit of sugar may be lowered.

An outstanding surgeon of India gave the writer the following cases arising from anxiety which had come under his observation and treatment: (1) A theological student was anxious about whether he should go on with his studies for the ministry. Out of anxiety came a disease of the thyroid gland. (2) An Indian father had a family of six to feed on an income of twelve rupees per month. Out of that anxiety neurosis a duodenal ulcer resulted. (3) A patient was operated on for appendicitis and the operation was successful, but suddenly the intestinal tract went inert and the patient died four days later. The doctor found the patient was worried over the death of his brother six days before. The doctor remarked that he would never have operated had he known this anxiety state of the patient. His patient revealed it too late. (4) A Frenchman was unable to walk; all treatment was useless until it was found out that the patient was unhappy in the place where he was working. He was transferred to another place and was well at once. He was not malingering—he could not walk. Anxiety had produced the paralysis. This surgeon added this statement: "Stomach ulcers have increased

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

throughout the world. There is no apparent dietetic condition responsible; more probably world anxiety is the cause." It has been definitely proved that the incidence of stomach ulcers goes up and down with the stock market.

Dr. R. D. Gillespie reports the case of a married woman who had all her teeth out as the result of a physical bias on the part of her physician: "If the doctor had only known it, she was unhappy at home; while the loss of her teeth made it all the more likely she would have to remain there."⁸

A friend of the writer, a doctor, tells me of one of her patients who died of a broken heart. Her husband, whom she loved, walked out of her house one day and went with another woman. The wife sickened and died "with no apparent disease whatever." The disease was the sorrow and consequent anxiety, which snapped the cord of life.

A well-known consultant in general medicine who sees as wide a range of conditions as most people and who certainly does not have any prejudices in favor of psychological medicine, tells a friend of mine that among the six most frequent diagnoses which he is called on to make, "anxiety neurosis" is one.

Physicians in California have recently remarked that one third of the practice of most physicians nowadays consists of patients who have what are called "anxiety states." These are patients whose symptoms are chiefly the result of what are called anxious reactions.

Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor, *Journal American Medical Association*, says: "These anxiety states may reflect themselves in the body physically by a wide variety of symptoms, including a rapid heart rate, a rise in the blood pressure, an inability to swallow, pains in the abdomen due to contraction of the lower outlet of the stomach, and an excessive breathing rate. . . . The patient develops hysterical symptoms, so that sometimes he will not see because he is convinced in his own mind that he cannot see, or he

* "Psychotherapy in General Practise," *The Lancet*, CCCIV, Vol. I, 1933.

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

will not hear because his subconscious mind tells him he cannot hear."

A doctor friend tells me of a case in which a young woman patient was on her bed for forty days with low fever. There was no organic disease, so he suspected mental and spiritual trouble. He found that a previous engagement with a young man which the girl desired was broken in favor of another which the parents desired. The second engagement was being forced on her against her will. The doctor succeeded in getting the parents to consent to allow the first engagement to go through. The fever left the girl at once. Anxiety was its cause.

Dr. Felix Deutsch, once practicing in Vienna, sums up the whole discussion on anxiety states in these words: "In patients suffering from organic diseases it was noticeable that their symptoms were the most abundant and the most distressing just in proportion to the amount of dammed-up anxiety that was present in their systems. Anxiety is of many kinds and many sources, but there is evidence for believing that anxiety which cannot be discharged in action is discharged in the form of diseases. To a degree, therefore, every disease is an anxiety disease. A person remains ill because he cannot get rid of his anxiety. To be healthy is to be free from anxiety."

In a survey in New York State only three per cent of the tuberculosis patients were able to pay for their own treatment. It showed that ninety-seven per cent were below the poverty line, and that in all probability anxiety had undermined their health and tuberculosis had set in.

In *A Mind that Found Itself*, Clifford W. Beers tells how he became a victim of a fear that he might become an epileptic like his brother, and how one day his will capitulated to that fear—he believed himself a confirmed epileptic and wanted to die. It was only as he got rid of that fear that he found himself again. He had lost himself in that fear.

Doctor Wittokowen (1935) in a comprehensive study has shown

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

that changes occur in all sorts of organs as a result of emotional disturbances. He records experiments on guinea pigs in which the rate of recovery from injury or infection was definitely hindered by painful or fear-producing emotional situations, while a decrease in the opsonin content is found in states of depression and painfully toned emotions.⁹

Anything, therefore, that gets rid of fear and anxiety helps get rid of disease. A Melbourne doctor says: "Do you know that the latest way of dealing with tuberculosis is the psychological approach? And they find that where there is emotional stress the removal of the strain cures the lesions more quickly than any physical measures—in fact hopeless cases rapidly recover."

Dr. Alexis Carrel, in *Man, the Unknown*, says, "Every one knows that hate, anger, and fear are capable of bringing confusion even to logic." He further says: "Thus hate, envy, fear, when these sentiments are habitual, are capable of starting organic changes and genuine diseases. . . . Colitis and the accompanying infections of the kidneys and the bladder are the remote results of mental and moral unbalance."¹⁰

While fear, in many cases, may not give rise to specific organic disease, it may stunt the growth of the whole person—body, mind, and spirit. This is corroborated by an experiment carried on by some scientists on rats which were put into a glass cage and fed the best food with all the vitamins present in it. On the other side of the glass panel they put a cat, and the rats lived under the constant fear of that cat. The result? They did not grow, they remained stunted and underdeveloped. Fear had paralyzed growth. On the other hand, other rats were placed in similar conditions with the same food, but without the cat. They grew and developed normally. Fear paralyzes growth, both in rats and in men. Any deliverance from fear is therefore a loosing of the powers of human development and makes for healthy, wholesome living.

⁹ *British Medical Journal*, June 10, 1939, p. 1165.

¹⁰ Alexis Carrel, *Man the Unknown*. Harper & Brothers.

ANXIETIES AND ILLNESS

But many lose not only themselves but their lifework as well through fear. The man in the parable said, "I was afraid, and I went and dug in the earth and hid my talent." The end of his lifework was a hole in the ground! Many people go through life producing nothing more than "a hole in the ground." And why did he accomplish nothing? "I was afraid and hid my talent." Fear paralyzed then and it paralyzes now.

One of the most tragic results of war was found in Britain in children who had undergone the strain of war and who as a result of this strain later turned out to be duds in their classes. Their mental growth was retarded by fear.

Worry and anxiety upset life—the whole of life. If an angry man cannot hit a golf ball, neither can an anxious man play tennis. From playing tennis and hitting golf balls on through to logic and one's lifework, havoc is spread by anxiety. And it eats like acid into the physical life, producing asthma, colitis, high blood pressure, tuberculosis, stomach ailments, heart disease, eczema, goiter, colds, arthritis, and death.

"We don't know why it is, but the worrier dies sooner than the non-worrier," said a Johns Hopkins professor. But some of us think we do know why it is: we are inwardly made for faith, not fear.

Was Jesus right, then, when He said, "Do not worry," and gave this remedy for the worry—faith in God? All life is crying out in corroboration at His realism.

Remedy: Bring up all those fears and anxieties to the surface and look at them frankly and squarely. Then look away from them to the cross and say to yourself: If that worst thing that can happen (the cross), can be turned into the best thing that can happen (my redemption), then I'll never be afraid again of anything, for I can use everything in my new-found purposes. Don't allow tomorrow's troubles to be telescoped into today—don't try to live a week at a time. Meet that next thing that faces you, and then the next thing, and so on through the day.

CHAPTER VII

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

WE SAW THAT THERE ARE FOUR OUTSTANDING THINGS that disrupt the human personality and with it, human society: resentments, anxieties, selfishness, and a sense of guilt. When the interpreters of the Kingdom of God insist that self-centeredness breaks the laws of that Kingdom, and hence the self-centered break themselves, are they just the voice of idealism, or are they proclaiming realism? Does science now stand alongside of them and proclaim the same thing?

It is true that there is a healthy self-love. The Kingdom of God and life demand that we love ourselves. No slovenliness is tolerated regarding the improvement of the self. If you do not improve the mind, it will dry up, no matter how pious you may be in the process. Those who say, "The Lord will provide," and then do not go out with might and main to help Him provide, will find themselves provided—with ashes! Those who roll their eyes piously, but neglecting to prepare, insist that God says, "Open your mouth and I will fill it," will find Him filling it—with air! Those who neglect the laws of health which are the laws of God, and then say, "The Lord will take care," will find that He will take care—that they die! A society which does not intelligently apply the law of justice and equality to the underprivileged, no matter how pious and religious it may be in the upper brackets, will die of gangrenous foot. And the man of science who, like Darwin, neglects poetry and music and other arts, will find, like Darwin,

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

that something has died within him. If a man gives five minutes a day to his spiritual life, and twelve hours a day to business, he must not complain that business is a hundred and forty-five times more real to him than religion. You must not expect miracles to happen unless you help them to happen. Practically all our insights come through foresights. We discover as we dare and do. The farmer who prays to get rid of his insects and the farmer who sprays to get rid of them are in an unequal race—the latter wins. God made him win, for if the first-named had won, then he would have been turned in the direction of the atrophy of the mind and the atrophy of intelligent endeavor. God would have helped his decay. There is no future for Christian healing of the body through prayer unless that prayer-endeavor is linked with sound psychology and sound physiological methods. The universe is open, but not to slovenliness, whether that slovenliness be physical, mental, spiritual, or sociological. The soul that sinneth—against the laws of itself, which are the laws of God, shall die. I do not mean to imply that God cannot and does not act except according to the known laws of nature. That would be to strait-jacket God in the known universe of nature. Miracles do happen; but miracles do not operate against the laws of nature, but according to the law of nature not yet understood by us. Miracles are the exertion of power according to laws beyond our ken, but the operation of these unknown laws does not give us license to neglect the known laws or to live against them. We must obey these laws or be broken by them.

But if it is true that we must love ourselves, it is also just as true that if we stop love with ourselves, then the self decays. Self-centeredness is self-suicide, though the process may be gradual and often unnoticed. The poison may be a slow poison but poison, nevertheless.

Doctor Link defines personality as follows: "I define personality as the extent to which the individual has habits and skills which interest and serve other people. . . . Its emphasis is on doing things

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

with and for other persons. Its essence is self-sacrifice, not self-gratification."¹ This is psychology coming out at exactly the place that religion has come out.

A self-centered self is an undeveloped, infantile self. Holman asks, "What are some signs of emotional infantilism? First, it is the inability of the individual to release himself from the control of the elemental impulse. We have heard more than one man who thought it 'was an evidence of his virility and strength say, 'I want what I want when I want it.' This is not maturity: it is infantilism."² As Doctor Künkel says, "It is characteristic of a child to have what we may designate as a small tension-capacity. He cannot endure for long the tension between his need and the final satisfaction; he cannot wait. . . . An adult, in so far as he is really grown up and not, as is unfortunately frequently the case, still partly a child, should be able to wait any length of time."³ On board ship in the Far East a business man in his two-hundred-and-twenty-five-pound dignity—or indignity—walked the deck like a caged animal, because, alas! his universe had fallen to pieces—his morning tea had not yet arrived. He could have lived, like the camel, on his own hump, for days and weeks with nothing but benefit, and yet he couldn't wait for ten minutes, lest he perish. When his petty self was crossed, he was not a man of mastery, but a man of misery.

Those who center themselves on themselves soon find the self disintegrating. There is one passage which Jesus used more than any other, and it is one that life uses more than any other: "He that saveth his life shall lose it." This is an eternal law written in the constitution of things. Center yourself on yourself and you won't like the self you are centered on. If you have your own way, you will soon not like your own way. Do as you like, and then you won't like what you do. Express yourself, and then you

¹ *The Rediscovery of Man*, p. 61. The Macmillan Company.

² C. T. Link, *The Religion of a Healthy Mind*, p. 8. Round Table Press, Inc.

³ Fritz Künkel, M.D., *What It Means to Grow Up*.

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

will soon not like the self you are expressing. It is no mere chance that the decade of self-expression in the West, especially among youth, was followed by an age of disillusionment and disgust. They had three sneers for everything and three cheers for nothing. The cynics are the self-centered, and the self-centered are the cynics. They are cynical about themselves and others—why? Because they are breaking themselves on the law that if we save our lives we lose them. Around the world the most absolutely happy people are the people who are losing themselves in self-forgetting service to others; and vice versa, the most miserable people are the people who are centered in themselves, are always self-remembering. We can take it or leave it, but that is the law, and it works with an almost mathematical precision. And it works in young and old.

A little girl of my acquaintance started out one day on an orgy of self-expression; in other words, she was naughty. Her mother said to her, "You do this, my child," and the child answered, "I don't want to." The mother then said, "You can do that." Again the child answered, "I don't want to." The mother, being very busy, said: "All right, then you do what you want to do." The little girl heaved a deep sigh and said, "I don't want to do what I want to do." She had her way and then she didn't like her way. She was breaking herself and her happiness against this law.

It is no mere chance, but the law of cause and effect, that the prayer of the prodigal was, "Father, give me"—he and his interests were at the center of his life. The result? Self-disgust. "He came to himself"—and when he came to himself, he was so disgusted with himself that he went back home with the prayer on his lips, "Father, make me." The self was so disintegrated by self-centeredness that it had to be remade.

A young man who had decided to leave home and have his own way, so that he could get "a kick out of life," was asked by a friend of mine, "Did you get a kick out of life?" "A kick?" replied the disillusioned young man, "I got a kick back. I'm going home."

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

The young man was simply illustrating this law. And this law works both among prodigal youth and among pious older people. When the disciples "were disputing in the way" which of them was greatest, did they find themselves in thus asserting themselves? On the contrary, they were never so small as when they were most trying to be big. If we knew nothing more of the disciples than this incident, we should never have looked at them twice. They would have been petty, quarrelsome egotists who would have been buried in the pages of dead history. But they pulled their feet out of that slough, and began to be self-forgetful and self-imparting, with the result? We are prepared to follow them to the death. They lost themselves and now those selves have come back in an ascendancy over our spirits.

There is a passage in Jude which vividly states this principle: "*They look after none but themselves—rainless clouds*" (Jude 12, Moffatt). Note that connection—they looked after none but themselves, and did they become rain clouds filled with beneficent rain for the thirsty earth? No, they became empty, rainless clouds. And those of us who have lived in dry and thirsty lands know what rainless clouds can mean in their hollow mockery to the famine-stricken people who look to them in vain.

There is another passage which says, "Wherever jealousy and rivalry exist, there disorder reigns and every evil" (James 3. 16, Moffatt). But if selfish struggle were the law of life, then you would expect rivalry and jealousy to bring order and every good. Do they? To ask it is to answer it, for the whole of history corroborated the fact that wherever jealousy and rivalry exist, there "disorder reigns and every evil." This is not a moral exhortation, but a historical exhibition.

This law of self-centeredness results in self-losing works in the individual and in the corporate state. While going along the streets of a town in China one is impressed how individualism reigns, especially in the old China. There are no rules to regulate the flow of traffic in behalf of the public good; there is not

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

even a custom of going to left or right. Each man is a law unto himself and at every step he is confronted with his neighbor, hence there is infinite confusion and consequent delay. Each man is his own policeman's whistle, so goes shouting at everybody else to get out of the way and everybody else shouts back at him to do the same. Everybody wants his own way and nobody gets his own way—the way is blocked.

While going along one of those streets one day a Chinese gentleman said to me, "You know that the encyclopedia says that ours is the dirtiest city in the world." I replied: "I cannot understand. These shops are electrically lighted and are beautifully clean, the gentlemen in them are dressed in silks, and they are also clean, but these narrow streets are filthy beyond words. Why the contrast?" My Chinese friend replied: "Don't you understand? These shops belong to those men, but these streets don't belong to anybody, so everybody throws their filth from the shops into the streets." That self-centered attitude with its consequent lack of corporate responsibility has been the cause of China's chaos and backwardness. It has made officials sell the country for personal gain. It has broken confidence in each other's integrity, so that I've seen merchants sitting on their goods in the freight trains, going to the city with the goods because they dared not trust them to each other, not even to the railway officials. So bad did this become that Dr. Hu Shih, the father of the Renaissance Movement, said, "If China is not destroyed, then God is blind." This was the bitter cry of a sincere nationalist, for China was saying from top to bottom of her life her characteristic saying, "It's not on my body." The result of that was that it was on everyone's body—as a disease and a problem.

But that whole situation was in the process of being changed. The sense of corporate responsibility was being extended from the shop to the street and from the street to the city, and from the city to the province and from the province to the state. Had that process been allowed to continue, China would have saved

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

herself. The miracle of the regeneration of a whole people was taking place before our eyes, and it was the most amazing thing in modern life; and then the selfishness of Japan asserted itself and threw death and confusion into this process. And now Japan must come under this law and break herself in the process of breaking China. China will arise through the fire of this dreadful suffering into a purified people and will witness the disintegration of her conquerors. I was on board a Japanese ship when war broke out in China and noted the hilarious spirit of the Japanese officers—China would be the vassal of Japan. Today that initial hilarious spirit has died down to soberness, and the soberness to anxiety, and the anxiety to fear, as they begin to see the consequences in long casualty lists, in her soldiers bogged and floundering in the morass of China, her economic structure giving way under the pressure, her friends throughout the world turning into enemies, and the future beginning to blacken with foreboding, for they have aroused a volcano of hate in the bosom of four hundred million people. The law has been broken—the law of saving your life and losing it, and the penalty must be paid. Japan could have had anything from China, yes, everything, if she had taken the way of loving her neighbor as she loved herself, but she loved herself and raped her neighbor, and she will have to pay, and pay dearly. I have bitter tears for China, but I have bitterer tears for Japan, for having sown the wind of oppression and cruelty she will reap the whirlwind of national degeneration of character and consequent calamity. Perhaps not today, and not tomorrow, but the third day, Yes!

Lest we Americans draw our cloaks about us in self-righteous disdain, let us remember that we are involved in this guilt. Besides the guilt of selling war materials to Japan to the extent of fifty per cent of the total, although this war material rained death on our friends, the Chinese, there is another way in which we are involved in this guilt. Japan pleaded that we do away with the national humiliation coming to her through our immigration

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

law. "If only one person comes in on the basis of equality, we are satisfied," said a Japanese to me. I pleaded with President Roosevelt and the national leaders at Washington that nothing we could do would have a greater effect in bringing peace and good will to the Pacific than just this act of friendship by putting Japan on the same quota basis as the rest. It would involve about a hundred and fifty Japanese people coming in each year, and this would be nothing among a people of a hundred and twenty million; it could never become an economic problem. President Roosevelt was sympathetic and promised to put it in his program. But it was too late. The Sino-Japanese conflict made it psychologically impossible for the time being. The result? We are spending more in a day on increased battleships which have been produced out of the fear of Japan, than it would have cost us to be friendly to Japan. Suppose it had cost us economically to let in those hundred and fifty Japanese each year. That economic cost would have been infinitesimal compared with the vast sums we are now spending in armaments in consequence of our fear of Japan. Had we been friendly to Japan, we might have turned the tide of events and might have headed off this wild and suicidal rampage in China. We refused to love our neighbor as we loved ourselves and we are paying for it—paying for it in hard cash, and, worse still, in hard hearts. We saved our life at that point and we lost it. We hurt ourselves in breaking this law.

And why is it that Europe is the cockpit of periodical furious fighting? For the simple reason that Europe has been the cockpit of greed and domination. Europe stretched her hands out across the world to bring under her domination and exploitation vast areas of the earth—colonies she called them. The spirit in which this was done can be seen from the following instructions given to Abel Tasman, who discovered Tasmania and after whom it was named: "Gold and silver are especially to be sought for, but keep the natives ignorant of the value of the same; appear as if you were not greedy for them; and if gold or silver are offered to you in any

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

barter, you must feign that you do not value these metals, showing them copper, zinc, and lead as if these minerals were of more value to us." Note: "Appear as if you were not greedy." But greed could not be hid, for it worked its slimy way across the world and has left a trail of exploitation and contention and war behind. Appear as if you were magnanimous—that is the window dressing of this vast exploitation of the world. When Sir Thomas Rowe came to India to the Court of Jehangir, the birthday of the Emperor came and magnificent presents were being given to the Emperor by the princes. Sir Thomas could not give such splendid presents so he hit upon an idea that greatly pleased Jehangir: he presented him with a map of the world with these words, "Your majesty, I present to you the world." At the very time of presenting the Emperor with the world he was getting a toe-hold in India, and that toe-hold meant India's final subjugation. Through it all there was a front of magnanimity, sometimes of apparent righteousness. In the process of bringing India under control, a Raja ill-treated some low-caste people. The foreign rulers were indignant and showed their righteous indignation by punishing the Raja for his misdeed. The punishment was that they confiscated his State and took it over, as their own! In doing so, they satisfied two things—their righteousness and their greed.

And now the Nemesis returns: Europe blows up in war all the gains exploited from the rest of the world. The terrible bill is now being paid in blood and fear and poverty.

The four horsemen of the Apocalypse are: The rider on the white horse holds a bow, and "he was given a crown and away he rode conquering and to conquer"—the first rider is Imperialism. The second rider, on a red horse, "was allowed to take peace from the earth and to make men slay each other"—the second rider is War. The third rider, on a black horse, "held a pair of scales in his hands saying, 'A shilling for a quart of wheat, a shilling for three quarts of barley.'" This rider is Famine. The fourth horseman, on a pale horse, had "power to kill men with the sword and

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

famine and plague and by the wild beasts of the earth." This horseman is Death. Here you have the four horsemen riding in succession: Imperialism, War, Famine, Death. The order is no mere chance order. These horsemen always ride in that order across the world. Imperialism produces war, and war produces famine, and famine produces death. You cannot have the first without the other three, for they hold together as cause and effect. Selfish Imperialism has been, is and ever shall be the parent of war. War has been, is, and ever shall be the parent of famine. And famine has been, is and ever shall be the parent of death.

When a Russian novelist said, "Europe has lost Christ, and Europe must perish," he was not uttering pious sentiments, but tracing sober history. And Europe lost Christ when she took Mammon as her god, keeping Christ, of course, as the window dressing. The only hope is that from this Europe which is going down in ashes and ruin, another Europe may arise, humbled, chastened, purified, Christian. If so she is saved; otherwise she perishes.

But why talk about Europe? The poison in the body of humanity has come to a head in an inflamed boil in Europe, but the poison is in the whole body. And the poison is this: At the basis of our economic life is the selfish competitive principle. Every man takes what he can get and the devil takes the hindmost. It is no use blaming the business man for this. He too is a victim, the victim of a system. He did not produce the system, he inherited it, and often struggles to get out of it, or to soften it. As Rauschenbusch said, "Our economic system tempts good men to do bad things." And no wonder, for "this system is an organized and legalized attempt to get the better of each other." In such a system the mind-set is in the wrong direction and everything else follows.

Neither science nor religion can save us except on a very small scale, unless we change the basis from selfish competition to co-operation. For as Dr. M. P. Plackett says: "Owner domination, in its capitalistic and swiftly maturing Fascist forms, has trans-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

formed science into a murderous cyclops who destroys his own sheep."⁴ Everything good is being turned to bad ends for the outlook is bad. "If your Eye is selfish, the whole of your body will be darkened." If the Eye—the outlook on life, is selfish, then the whole of the rest of life is shrouded in darkness. And the future too holds no light unless we change. Julian Huxley says: "The coming years present two pictures: either science in chains to the profit motive, or science free to do its possible service to human welfare." Whether we shall free science depends on whether we free ourselves from a system which is basically unchristian.

A man stood in a cathedral in Europe expatiating on the wonders of science, when he suddenly stopped, looked up and saw a shell hole in the roof, and then slowly said, "But this also is science." Science is blowing holes in the roofs of our magnificent cathedrals, but it is doing more—it is blowing holes in the fabric of humanity, in the characters and morale of our people through unemployment. Ten million idle in America. Why? Improved machinery saved their labors and threw them out. But why did science do that? Because science is harnessed to a selfish system that cares for profits and not for persons. A man had jute shares which went down in price. He sighed and said, "Well, I'll have to wait for another war to get back my profits again." "Have to wait for another war"—the brutality of that statement cannot be concealed, for it means that he will coin fear and blood and blasted bodies and blasted homes and famine, into his own profit. The chances are that this man is not nearly as bad as this makes him out to be. He is caught in a system which must ultimately produce just that kind of mentality.

Do not misunderstand me; I am not against the profit system. I want more profits than this system is able to produce, but I want them more widely distributed. If we can harness the profit motive

⁴ *Frustration of Science.*

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

to the collective good. instead of to a privileged few, then we may be saved. In that case we would have the drive of the profit motive without the destructiveness it now has.

Can this system of collective selfishness be in operation without producing its Nemesis? It cannot. The Nemesis is this: Just as Europe blows up in war her wealth gained through the exploitation of others, so America blows up her wealth through having to support ten millions of unemployed—and having to support them permanently, for it is no passing phase. It is inherent in the system as effect from cause. And the cause in Europe and America is the same—a selfish struggle for profits at home and abroad. The devastation through war is the more vivid, but the devastation wrought through the wearing down of morale and character, by unemployment, may be just as bad, though more silent and often unseen. Those ten million unemployed become the unstable balance which may overthrow this system. It is producing the seeds of its own decay within itself.

Those who are successful in the system find it hard to see this, for we turn a blind eye to it. A white man in South Africa said rather innocently: "But I don't see that this system particularly hinders me from being a Christian. I do not feel any disability from it." I replied: "No, you do not feel it particularly, for the system is made for you—the successful white man; but what about the brother seated alongside you—the Negro? Ask him what he feels about it. He is on the outside of the areas of the benevolent working of the system. It presses like iron into his soul at every turn." This could be vividly seen when gold doubled in price. The holders of the shares in South African gold mines sat and rubbed their hands in glee at the increased dividends. The white employees in the mines, such as the overseers and engineers, had their wages increased somewhat. The Negro laborer in the mine had his wages increased—not one farthing. He still got his shilling a day, at least until years after the rise in the price of gold. For whom was the system made? Obviously, for the holder of capital,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

with the white employee on the edge of the benefit and the Negro laborer beyond the pale.

The basic wrong is this: this system is a vast attempt to do without working; to be able to live on the labor of someone else. In other words, it is an attempt to get on the backs of other people to make them carry you. The man becomes a means to your ends; and your end is: stop working and get someone else to work for you; for that is the meaning of living by your capital. It is the power to make someone else work for you while you do not work at all.

Is this conclusion arrived at by one who is supposed to say this kind of thing because he is a teacher of Christianity? Then listen to Doctor Thomas, one of the outstanding economists of India, who said at the close of one of my addresses: "As an economist I want to verify what the speaker has said. Our world trouble is selfishness. If we had co-operation, we could do anything. It is shortsighted selfishness which is blocking everything."

If this system does not kick back in result, then God is blind; but God is not blind, so the system does kick back in result, and the result is the very opposite from what we expected. The sponsors of this system, instead of being carried, now have to carry ten million unemployed on their shoulders. We sowed an attempt to make people work for us, and we reap in result ten million unemployed for whom we have to work, and in so doing we are conscious that our very carrying this burden does not solve the problem, but only heightens it, for these unemployed are the very means for the overthrow of the system. So we have to carry people who will crush us in the end. We reap what we sow.

As Macmurray says: "The claim to special privilege and special service can only be made good by pleading special weakness and special helplessness. It is the weak, the sick, the very young or the very old on whose behalf a proper claim for privileged treatments can be made. The healthy man who feels he has to be waited on and served by others is a hypochondriac. A society

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

which denies equality is suffering from general neurosis."⁵ If you do not give equality, you get neurosis. You hurt yourself.

The will to power, therefore, is self-frustrating—whether that will to power be in the individual, in an economic system, or in the corporate life, the State. "He that saveth his life shall lose it"—is written across the whole.

"When men set out to achieve an intention which is contrary to the divine intention, they do not achieve it. They achieve something they do not intend. . . . There is no need for an intervention of God to frustrate the purposes of men who are in opposition to Him, since they cannot be in opposition to Him without being in opposition to themselves. They themselves are, after all, God's act, and His intention is embodied in their nature. To act in defiance of the will of God is to attempt the impossible. But that does not mean that we have achieved nothing. On the contrary, we have achieved something which we did not intend. The situation we have produced is not determined by our intention. It is determined by the nature of reality, by the nature of our own reality, which we are negating. Then whether our intention conforms to the purpose of God or opposes it, we cannot achieve anything but the purpose of God."⁶

There is nothing, absolutely nothing, so true in the moral world as that the centering on oneself means the losing of oneself, whether that self be the individual self, the social self, the economic self, or the national self. Self-centeredness is disruptive—intrinsically so. On board ship a child of second-class passengers was playing with a ball and it went through the barrier over into first class. When the child went after it, a child of first class passengers said angrily to the other, "You get back on your own side, you common little child." Of course the little girl went back hurt and angry. She had been insulted. But this is the

⁵ John Macmurray, *The Clue to History*, p. 79. Harper & Brothers.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

point: the child who uttered the words hurt herself more. She disrupted her own nature—the pouting lips and the angry discontent showed that something had happened within her. From that moment she was at war with herself—part of herself saying, “Aren’t you ashamed of yourself?” and the other part entering into a long self-justification. A cleavage had been driven into her soul. Moreover, a cleavage had been driven between her and the other child and all other children whom she represented. On the other hand, had she handed back the ball with a smile, friendship and good will would have broken down that barrier, and the child would have gone on with her play with a sense of self-approval, hence of happiness and fellowship. Now she had a barrier in her own inner life and had erected a barrier, a very real one, between herself and all other children not of her “class.” The class war was deepened. She had called another “common,” with the result that she herself became not merely common but contemptible in her own eyes and in the eyes of others. Her punishment was self-imposed. She had to live with her own self—a self which in her heart of hearts she could not respect.

Selfishness, therefore, is its own punishment. Jesus said no more terrible words than these: “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate”—you wanted yourself and now, I am afraid, I will have to let you have yourself. And that very self will be your punishment. I withdraw and leave you to yourself. The greatest punishment to the eye is to withdraw the light, of the heart to withdraw love, of the aesthetic nature to withdraw beauty, of the soul to withdraw Christ. For Christ is the Kingdom, and when the Kingdom is withdrawn, our way to live goes with it. That is desolation.

On board ship I saw two very corpulent persons who were angry with the table stewards because they did not give them super-service. They seemed to be afraid they might starve between courses! Their physical appetites seemed the one thing that mattered to them. I never saw them reading a book or paper.

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

They sat between meals and stared out, apparently waiting for the next meal. One night I saw them sitting thus and staring blankly, when a bright idea flashed across the dull brain of the man. He went to the mantelpiece and picked up the vases, and looked into them and then returned to his wife with the news: "They're empty." I came very near laughing. He was right: "They're empty," but it wasn't merely the vases! The souls and brains of both of them were empty. They had much in their purses, but nothing in their persons; and that was their punishment.

I laid aside this writing to go to arrange for a little boy to go to school. He heard I was coming for this purpose, and when I arrived I found he had locked himself up in his mud hut—locked himself away from education, away from opportunity, away from everything I could do for him. Behold, your house is left unto you—desolate.

That self need not be an ignorant, uncouth self to be desolate. It may be very refined by education and culture and yet very empty. Take a very highly sophisticated man like H. L. Mencken: "I have not written and published to please other people, but to satisfy myself, just as a cow gives milk, not to profit the dairyman, but to satisfy herself." Self-satisfaction is the center of his activity, so he says. The result? "What the meaning of life may be, I don't know: I incline to suspect it has none."⁷ Note that these two things go together, and they always go together: Let the self be the end, and the meaning drops out of life. On the other hand, the great Indian scientist, C. V. Raman, says in the same series of life confessions gathered by Durant: "I find self-control and not self-indulgence to be the real source of happiness." Raman's way is a better way than Mencken's, for self-control is better than self-indulgence. But even that falls below the Kingdom way which is self-losing in the service of God and man.

⁷ Quoted by Durant, *On the Meaning of Life*, pp. 32, 35. Julian Messner, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Pleasure is the gratification of one instinct at the expense of other instincts, or the goal of life. Mere pleasure-seeking, therefore, brings inward disruption, sets one instinct against another instinct, and divides the man against himself. Pleasure, therefore, can never bring happiness. For happiness is the harmonious expression of all the instincts in the pursuit of the goal of life. Jude puts the case vividly: "These people are murmurers, grumbling at their lot in life—they fall in with their own passions" (Jude 16, Moffatt). Note the connection between the two: They fall in with their own passions, and as a result they are murmurers, grumbling at their lot in life. They grumble with their lot in life, and lash against their circumstances, but this discontent with life is an exteriorization of the discontent they have with themselves.

On board the *Queen Mary* I went into the drawing room in the early morning and found the steward trying to bring order out of chaos from the gay party the night before. He showed me beautiful green leather chairs with holes burned in their backs by cigarette ends. I was astonished at such vandalism and asked, "Why do they do this?" To which he replied, "Oh, they were trying to have a good time." Working hard till late in the morning in the pursuit of happiness and ending in this imbecility! They probably described it as "a hell of a time," and they were right with the emphasis on the "hell." For they had landed themselves in the hell of self-discontent and self-loathing. The most pathetically discontented people in the world are the people who are most vigorously pursuing happiness. It eludes them. They chase the butterfly of pleasure up the volcano side, feeling at every step they will grasp it, till, reaching the top, they make a lunge at it and fall over the crater's edge into the abyss of self-loathing. Is this the viewpoint of a kill-joy moralist? Can it be dismissed as such? All right, let us turn back again to the scientists. Dr. William S. Walsh, speaking from the standpoint of mental health and not that of a moralist, says: "One thing surely

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

indicated is a reappraisal of the valuation we have placed on certain possessions, pleasures, and goals which beckon but which, even though won, rarely provide satisfactions supposedly inherent in them. This is particularly true of material wealth." The man of mental science sees that wealth, which should be weal-th, often turns into the opposite, ill-th. The person becomes ill under it and loses himself.

Self-centeredness is national, social, spiritual, and physical ill-th. Dr. Franz Alexander, of the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis, speaks of self-centeredness resulting in mucous colitis. "These individuals," he says, "are aware of their need for service and affection and, in fact, are constantly complaining that they do not get all they deserve in view of what they do for others. The service given by these persons is most generally confined to lip-service instead of real doing. Another type is found in the chronic sufferer from constipation. These persons excuse their lack of willingness to do for others by saying that no one does anything for them. They do not expect anything and so do not need to give. They cannot relax because of a real, though unconscious fear of starvation."⁸ The "starvation" was for love; but they could not get it unless they gave it—they could not give it because they were self-centered, and because they were self-centered, they were ill.

One of the most vivid illustrations of the disruptive results of selfish attitudes is seen in the group concerned in the discovery of anesthesia. Its discovery was the giving to the world one of the most beneficial discoveries ever made. It might have been a dedication of God's gift to suffering humanity. Instead, the discovery was marred by personal quarrels and jealousy which disrupted the beauty of the whole discovery, and more—these quarrels and jealousies disrupted the persons themselves and brought on tragedy. Rene Fulop Miller says: "C. W. Long, H.

* "Science News Letter," January 8, 1934.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Wells, C. J. Jackson, and W. Morton—all came to an unhappy end through jealousy and strife over this wonderful discovery. Wells committed suicide in prison. Long died suddenly in embitterment. Jackson's hatred of Morton is said to have brought him to a lunatic asylum. Morton died of a stroke induced by reading one of Jackson's attacks on him" (p. 322). Each one defended himself against the others and each lost himself in the defense.

This whole discussion can be summed up in the words of Macmurray: "A self that has become its own end is in bondage to itself and cannot escape from itself. In its effort to save its own life of freedom, it loses it. Ego-centric freedom is self-negating—the law of self-frustration."⁹ And this law of self-frustration runs through the whole gamut of life from the individual's physical life clear through to the national and the international life. If an individual is ill, physically, mentally, and spiritually ill, until he gives himself to something outside of himself so that he is lifted beyond himself and finds himself in a larger whole, so at the other end of the gamut the League of Nations is ill. It is nigh unto death, because it made the tragic mistake of leaving each national self intact, not surrendered to something outside itself, so that each national self might have found itself in a larger whole of human brotherhood. Each national self made the great refusal of self-surrender to a larger whole, and the League disintegrates, and war ensues. Humanity is breaking itself upon a law of the Kingdom. We must wander through another period of war and strife until, chastened by it all, we may yet make the national self-surrender and immediately find ourselves in a world brotherhood.

And what is true in the magnificent is true in the minute. One of the greatest tuberculosis experts in the world told me that one of the therapeutic measures adopted is to get tuberculosis patients

⁹ John Macmurray, *The Clue to History*, p. 176. Harper & Brothers.

THE SELF-CENTERED ARE THE SELF-DISRUPTED

to find an interest outside of themselves to which they can give themselves. As long as they are always thinking of themselves, even if their thoughts are directed toward getting well, they will heal very slowly or not at all. "The merry heart doeth good like medicine," and the merry heart can only be had when the heart is lifted out of itself and its own troubles.

One of my best friends in India is a high government official, a radiant and effective Christian. A few years ago he was inwardly beaten as a result of self-centeredness. His health was shattered, he loathed India and Indians, and looked forward only to the time when he would get his pension and get out of it all. He thought himself badly abused by fate. Then he began to see himself as the center of the trouble. He made a self-surrender to the will of God. He shifted the basis of his life from self-will to God's Will. Life then had a reason, a meaning, a purpose, a cause. He lost his life and he found his life. Today he is well in body and mind and soul. He loves India and Indians, and both have responded in love. And he is creative—creating good will on the Northwestern frontiers of India, where the poison of ill will has gone deep through blood feuds. "Give me back my eyesight for five minutes," said one of these frontiersmen to a mission doctor. "What will you do with those five minutes?" asked the doctor. "I will shoot my enemy," replied the embittered man. In that atmosphere my friend works, and he works miracles—miracles of healing embittered situations and embittered people.

Until the moment of his self-surrender he was like a flywheel in a great factory which had slipped off the center and was shaking itself and the building to pieces, a thing of destruction to itself and its surroundings. But the moment he slipped into the will of God he was like the flywheel back on its center now going around with rhythm, power, and constructive energy. He had found his center—the will of God.

As we look back through our study of self-centeredness and its

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

effects it becomes a proven fact—as proven as the force of gravity—that self-centeredness is corrosive and disruptive both to the individual and to society.

Remedy: If you have been self-centered, become Christ-centered by a surrender of your life—soul and body and possessions and your future to Him. If you feel you have already had your self upon the cross and yet no release has come, perhaps you are like the pastor who felt he was being unjustly treated by being sent to smaller charges and who said very bitterly to one of his laymen: “I am hanging on the cross.” “Yes,” replied the layman, “but you have never died.” It went home. It was true. So he really surrendered and really died. A new man arose. Two hundred and eighty-five people were converted that year. Make a decisive surrender like that; really die to yourself and live to Christ. See Chapter X.

CHAPTER VIII

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

WE SAW THAT BOTH THE DOCTORS AND THE CHRISTIAN faith teach that the four great disruptive things in human life are resentments, anxieties, self-centeredness, and a sense of guilt. We have looked at the first three. As we come to think of the problems created in human personality by the fourth, the sense of guilt, we are liable to think at once of the condemned prisoner, sitting in his cell, bowed under the sense of guilt and shame, awaiting his doom. That picture puts us off the track. "For," we say, "I do not fit into that picture; I have no overburdening sense of guilt, and, therefore, this whole discussion is beside my point."

But perhaps you do feel a sense, it may be vague and undefined, of futility, of getting nowhere, of having missed the way, of inward maladjustment. Well, that is guilt. It shows that you have seen something beyond yourself, higher than yourself, into which you are not fitting. A tension has been set up between your life and the unseen Kingdom. A clash ensues between your will and this higher Will. If you obey it, then life has a sense of stepping up and consequently of inward approval; if not, then of stepping down and consequently of inward disapproval. Conscience, therefore, becomes the sword point of evolution, as Kagawa says.

I sat with an intelligent young woman who was deciding a moral question that would affect the whole of her life. The moral tension involved was terribly painful. As we sat there a friendly dog came up and put up his head between us. As she patted its

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

head she said with a smile that was akin to pain: "Who wouldn't be a dog? It has no moral battles like this." "The difficulty is," I replied, "that you can't be a dog. You are about to try to live a dog's life, and yet you still remain a person. And you are taking hell straight into your heart when you take that conflict within yourself." She saw it clearly and with a mighty effort rose out of it. Today she is unified and radiant.

A sense of guilt arises out of an estrangement that comes when we do not live to the highest that we see. We know that man is not made for evil, for when he commits it, there is a sense of orphanage, of estrangement, of being out of harmony. On the other hand, when he does right, there is a sense of being at home, of being universalized, of being inwardly and outwardly harmonized. This he feels to be his native air. He was made for it. Evil breaks up all that and introduces into life a sense of estrangement. This estrangement is a fourfold one—a self-estrangement, a universe-estrangement, a brotherhood-estrangement, and a God-estrangement.

First of all there is a self-estrangement. Doctor Mackay says, "A sinner is a human being who has become a problem to himself." There is no worse hell than the hell of having to live with a self which you cannot respect. The hell of being bad is a bad hell. "Why didn't you take that money when you had a chance?" asked someone of a youth. To which the youth thoughtfully replied, "Because I did not want to live with a thief." He did not care to introduce that hell into his life. There was the horrible punishment in ancient times of tying up a dead body with a living man, so that the living man carried around this decaying corpse. This youth did not want voluntarily to tie this decaying body of dishonesty to himself and have to live with its rottenness. He loved himself too much to damn himself to that.

"But it is all right," said a young woman who was justifying her sex license, "it's all right if you can get away with it." "If you can get away with it," I slowly repeated. "Ah, there's the

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

rub. You can't. You've got to live with yourself, and it will be a self which you will not be able to respect. You are on the road to self-loathing. You have taken Guilt by the hand and will walk with him through life. He will never leave you. And you will be so weary of his clammy presence that you will cry out to be let alone."

"Man fled astray

With feeble steps over the world's wilderness

And his own thoughts along that rugged way

Pursued like raging hounds their father and their prey."

There is a striking passage in Revelation 10. 10 (Moffatt): "*It did taste sweet like honey*, but when I had eaten it, it was bitter to digest." People often find sex freedom as sweet as honey to the taste, but when they have eaten it and have tried to assimilate it into life, have tried to fit it in with the rest of themselves, it is bitter to digest. It all stays like a dull lump in the chest, an undigested, poisonous thing.

We may smile at the theological professor who stood in the seminary chapel and earnestly prayed: "O God, don't let any student graduate from this seminary who has not read *The Scarlet Letter*." But we know what he meant. No man is fit to deal with human problems who has not seen and seen vividly that sin is self-punishing and that there is no escape. The woman in *The Scarlet Letter*, as punishment, was compelled to wear around her neck on a placard the scarlet letter "A" for "Adulteress." It flared before everyone to her shame. But the man was scot free and honored and respected, for no one knew. No one knew? *He* knew. And now and again men saw him clutch at his heart as if in pain. Then on the fateful day he falls in a swoon before the assembled hosts, and in falling tears open his shirt bosom, and when men stooped to pick him up, they found written over his heart the scarlet letter "A," written in his own blood. He had

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

not escaped. No one does. For "Thou shalt not commit adultery" is written not merely in the tables of stone, but is written in the very constitution of your being. The adulterer wears the scarlet letter over his heart. Moreover, it is hung on his face in downcast looks and furtive eyes and sensual lips and a general gray dullness of countenance. The sparkle of purity is gone and dullness, the sign of inward death, gives away the case—to the man and to the world.

He may protest his innocence, as Peter did at the denial of his Master, and he may protest it with the vehemence of swearing to his innocence, but the cock crows. The cock crows—nature betrays him, and his false world of self-justification falls to pieces. He goes out to weep bitterly.

A doctor told a friend of mine of a Hindu patient who, on a certain date, came to the doctor to let out blood from a certain spot on his wrist—a spot which pained him badly. The doctor could find nothing wrong; but the next year, on the same date, the man came again with the same request. The third year, the doctor insisted on getting the story behind it; and found that the man had stabbed his wife in the wrist on that date and had killed her. The guilt brought out the physical pain on his own wrist. Today he is brooding over that guilt in prison.

In an attempt to make aeroplane traveling safe, there has been installed, in many machines, an instrument, locked in and sealed at the back, which keeps an absolutely accurate record of everything that happened on the journey—the speed, the altitude, the ups and downs, everything is recorded. At the end of the journey the instrument is unsealed; and no matter what the pilot may say, the record is there. No excuses prevail against this terrifying accuracy. It is a mechanical conscience, but that mechanical conscience is not more accurate than this conscience sealed within us in the very depths of our being. The key is not in our hand. It is in the hands of our Maker, and the record is absolutely cor-

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

rect down to the recording of thought and intention, and there is no appeal from it.

“The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.”

“Ah,” you say, “he is preaching morals at us. We have heard it all before.” Yes, and now we are hearing it anew from the men of science. Their voice is quiet and low and deliberate. They do not shout, but is it any less terrifying? If anything, it is worse. Note again that the statistics, given in a previous chapter, from Dr. Stanley Cobb concerning hundreds of cases suffering from arthritis, asthma, and mucous colitis, say that ninety-six per cent had resentments, seventy-five per cent were depressed in spirit and sixty-eight per cent expressed feelings of guilt. Note that “sixty-eight per cent expressed feelings of guilt,” but what about those who had them, but did not express them? Were the ninety-six per cent who held resentments not guilty in the very resentments themselves? In any case, sixty-eight per cent expressed a sense of guilt, and that sense of guilt worked its way into the physical life, bringing havoc and disease there in the form of asthma, arthritis, and mucous colitis.

But it works its way out in other diseases. Dr. Erwin Moor reports the case of a man with a systolic blood pressure of two hundred and eight, who was also afflicted with lung disorder, and whose urine analysis showed traces of albumin. Rest and drugs brought no beneficial effect, but one day the patient remarked that he had done a great wrong to his wife. The doctor immediately arranged a meeting between the estranged husband and wife, and after a friendly discussion between the two, the blood pressure fell to a hundred and fifty, the lung symptoms abated,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and the albumin disappeared. Several years later the patient was in good health, with a blood pressure of only a hundred and thirty. When he got rid of guilt he got rid of the basis of his trouble.

A judge of a Court of Domestic Relations came to a friend of mine for treatment of a nervous disorder. The doctor, sensing the fact that such a disorder could not come except from some inner conflict, said to the patient, "Judge, is there a conflict of some kind in your life?" "Conflict?" said the judge, "my God, there is nothing else but conflict within me." The facts came out that he tried to appear true to his wife, and at the same time kept a mistress. That conflict within him brought on this nervous trouble, as the way out of the impossible position of being a judge in a Domestic Relations Court, while he himself was having such domestic relations.

A man came to me for help. He was nervously unstrung and fast losing his grip on life and on himself. Highly intelligent and capable and young, yet he had lost his job because of incapacity to hold it. He was going straight downhill and medicine seemed powerless to help him. In conversation he told me he had wronged his wife through unfaithfulness. I insisted that we must call his wife and tell her. He was frightened and pleaded that it would kill her. I insisted that what was happening to him was killing her. I met her in the hall and told her not to go to pieces under what he told her, to try to help him out. He told the whole story and I saw forgiving love wipe out a wretched page. And after prayer, when the two went out of that room arm in arm, and his face and hers were lighted up, I knew he was a well man. It was inward guilt that was shattering him.

The scientific therapeutic thing to do in that case was the thing our Christian faith has always insisted must be done, namely, get the sin up and out through confession and find forgiveness from God and man. No wonder Dr. Henry C. Link, after years of dealing with maladjusted people, was forced to realize that "the

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

findings of psychology in respect to personality were largely a rediscovery of old religious truths."

A doctor friend told me of a case where a man had a very high blood pressure. The doctor found that the man thought he had committed the unpardonable sin. When he was assured that his sin was pardonable and when he found pardon, then the blood pressure dropped to normal. Forgiveness brought fitness.

A doctor in Prague told a friend of mine of the case of a young man who had tuberculosis. He was too poor to go to the sanatorium, but when the doctor found that he had a sense of guilt in his life, he went to work on that instead of on the disease. When the sin was confessed and forgiveness received, then the patient got well without going to a sanatorium. This did not happen at once but when the conditions that made the disease possible were taken away, the healing process set in. Isaiah saw the connection between forgiveness and the healing of sickness: "None in the land shall say, then, 'I am sick,'

for all who live there shall have their sins forgiven."

(33. 24, Moffatt.)

Those psychoanalysts who counsel patients who have hates to continue their hates, lest by suppression a complex be set up, and those who have trouble with sex to go to a prostitute from the same fear of the formation of a complex, are completely on the wrong track. In two such cases who had followed such advice, I found the results had been disastrous. In one of them the continued hate wore her out, physically, and left her exhausted; and in the other the promiscuity produced such a sense of guilt that physical health grew worse. In both cases there was release and perfect cure when they faced the wrong, confessed it, and found the forgiving grace of God. Both of them are radiant, helpful persons today. They now belong to the cure, rather than to the disease.

Doctor Latif, who carries on an extensive practice in helping people back to mental and physical health by psychoanalysis, says:

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

"None of the authorities in psychological medicine from whose works we have quoted have ever suggested the desirability of promiscuous sexuality. On the contrary, they have often referred to it as a possible cause of mental conflict and psycho-neurosis. Even Sigmund Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, who in his medical practice discovered that sexual maladjustment was one of the most potent factors in the aetiology of some psycho-neuroses, has always fought against what Pfister calls 'the scientifically and ethically reprehensible wild-psychanalysis,' which expects cure from promiscuous sexual gratification without regard to the scruples of love."

On the other hand, Dr. Alexis Carrel says, "In order to reach its full power intelligence seems to require both the well-developed sex glands, and the temporary suspension of the sexual appetites." This from a scientist. And now this, from a philosopher: "Methods of birth control, as well as advances in preventive and curative medicine, have lessened the risks and penalties that attach to unchastity. None the less, promiscuity would be likely still to prove, as it has proved throughout history, a sure road to degeneration of physique and degradation of character."¹

Evil brings self-estrangement, but it also brings a universe-estrangement. Nature reflects our moods. If we are inwardly guilty, then Nature droops with our inner drooping. If we are inwardly reconciled, then Nature claps her hands in responsive joy. This is true of the way we approach Nature to gain our living. If we are predatory and ruthless toward Nature, she will more than close up, she will respond in fury. Cut down the trees of the hills in ruthless greed, and Nature will respond in floods and wash away your wealth. Plow up the prairies in heedless haste in search of grain that will turn into gold, and Nature will give you—dust and more dust. Go ruthlessly over the world in greed to extract wealth and plant your colonies to exploit the

¹ Lord Samuel, *Belief and Action*, p. 145. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

people, and Nature, and then your colonies, will not pay. And when they do pay they will become a bone of contention, and wars will waste your wealth. Refuse to love your neighbor as you love yourself when you come to Nature, be ruthlessly competitive in your approach and your whole economic machinery has sand in it, warehouses are stuffed and the people starved, your money becomes devaluated and useless. Life breaks down.

But approach Nature in the co-operative spirit and Nature co-operates with you and supplies all your needs. And more: your very endeavor to get your bread becomes a fellowship instead of a feud. You can now commune with Nature because you have in common with your brother.

This responsiveness of Nature to our character is vividly shown by Hosea, who saw this connection long ago:

"I will betroth her [this nation] . . . in a bond
of goodness and justice . . .

On that day, the Eternal declares,

I will answer the heavens,

the heavens shall answer the earth,

the earth shall answer the grain,

the new wine and the oil,

and they shall answer Jezreël [the valley];

I will re-people Jezreël, in the land,

I will have mercy on Nomeracy,

to Norfolk I will say 'My folk,'

and they shall say, 'Thou art my God.' " (2. 18-23, Moffatt.)

The beginning of this cycle was "goodness and justice." When that was established, then God answered the query of the heavens, "Shall I give to earth or shall I not?" And when the word is given, the heavens answer the cry of the earth and the earth answers the cry of the grain and the grain answers the cry of the people. Then, since there is fellowship with each other in justice, there is fellowship with God: He has mercy on Nomeracy,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and with Norfolk He enters into fellowship, and they in turn enter into fellowship with God. The circle is complete, harmony has been re-established. Nature is responsive to justice in man. I am persuaded if we repented of our corporate selfishness and gave justice to every man Nature would supply our needs, and more. Where this does not take place, however, the opposite occurs: "No fidelity, no kindness,
no knowledge of God in the land.
. . . Hence the land is woebegone,
its denizens all droop;
even the beasts and birds
and the very fish within the sea are perishing."

(Hosea 4. 1-3, Moffatt.)

Man's guilt leads him to a universe-estrangement.

But it leads also to a brotherhood-estrangement. Where evil exists, there exists a state of estrangement between man and man. A barrier is set up. Sin not only separates from God—it separates from man. There is no cement in sin. It is centrifugal and divisive. The essence of sin is self-will, and this self-will is bound to run against self-will in others. Hence, sin, by its very nature, is bound to be disruptive and divisive in human relationships.

A man came to the doctor—couldn't sleep, nervously gone to pieces. The doctor, after going over him and finding nothing wrong, said: "Have you got anything on your conscience?" The man was furious and retorted: "I came here to get medical treatment and not to be pried into." The next day, however, he came back and said: "You're right; I have something on my conscience. Our father died and left an estate and I was made executor. I kept back part of my brother's share—I stole it." The doctor insisted that he write then and there to his brother confessing it. He went with him to mail it. When it actually dropped into the box he grasped the hand of the doctor and said, "Thank God that burden is gone." He was a well man from that hour.

The life of the guilty man is driven underground, is furtive;

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

but goodness is expansive. It excludes none except those who exclude themselves. Barriers had gone down on the outside because they had gone down on the inside.

Guilt brings another estrangement—a God-estrangement, and that is the most serious of all, for unless we are assured that we are reconciled to the heart of things, then life feels a fundamental out-of-gearness. It has no assurance where it needs it most. No matter how we may try to forget that fact, and try to slur it over, there is an inward gasp of emptiness and meaninglessness that will not down. A highly respected and honored man ran away with a young woman, leaving his lovely family to find their way through life. He wrote to me, in answer to my pleadings to break with it all and come back to God, that he had found God's approval in this act—how could this beautiful new love be wrong? It must be of God, he argued. Moreover, he asserted that he was going to establish a new religious body on the basis of a broader love of God that was not narrow and bigoted and Puritanical. He was attempting deliberately to rationalize his sin, for our desires draw arguments to themselves like a magnet draws iron filings. We do not think with our minds primarily, but with our emotions. He not only tried to rationalize, he also tried to make it religious, and thus respectable. He put on a brave front and tried to keep up his courage through the years, but it was of no use. He was fighting a losing battle, for his conscience would not down. Finally, as a broken old man, he wrote me, pathetically: "Pray for me, for I am an old prodigal that never returned." He was beaten in his fight. If "the lack of fellowship is hell," then he was there already. He had chosen it when he chose to break his fellowship with God. On the other hand, the woman saw the drift, bravely faced her sin, got her feet out of its meshes by open confession, took her children away, brought them up through hard work, and today they are a happy family—educated, honored, useful. The beginning of her rise was reconciliation with God. She could not have climbed this long, uphill grade had she been pressed

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

from within by a crushing load of guilt. With that gone, her feet fairly bounded up the hill.

A young man came to a friend of mine seeking health, and when the basis of his ill health was found, it proved to be dishonesty—he was collecting from a coal-and-wood firm and was keeping back part of the collections. He was so worried over it that it made him sick. He confessed his dishonesty to his employer, who replied, “Do you want your old job as collector back?” “But you wouldn’t trust me, would you?” the young man asked in astonishment. To which the employer replied, “I’d rather have a young man who has come clean the way you have done than to take chances with a new one.” This young man was given such release and joy that his sickness disappeared.

“What do men most desire?” asked Nixon, the author of that brilliant book, *The Human Situation*, and the answer he gives is this: “Peace of mind; to be at home in a friendly world. We desire reconciliation, a harmony between ourselves and our surroundings.” In other words, we need freedom from this four-fold estrangement. We need healing at the heart; and then only will health spread through all our relationships.

To this medical science agrees: “This recovery and freedom from relapse depends in large measure upon the patient’s degree of emotional stability and on the satisfactoriness of his philosophy of life.”² “On the satisfactoriness of his philosophy of life”—note that, and also note that no philosophy of life is, or can be satisfactory, that does not provide for the healing of inward guilt. No change of outer condition or circumstance can atone for that central need unmet.

“Remember this and you will be better,” said a doctor to a patient leaving his office—“remember that God is love.” The patient came back and confronted the doctor with these earnest words, “Prove that to me, Doctor, and I’ll go out of here not only

² Doctor Gordon, *British Medical Journal*, June 10, 1939.

A SENSE OF GUILT AND ILL HEALTH

a better man, but a well man." The patient was right. Jesus knew that there could be no bodily soundness without an inner soundness, so He said to the sick of the palsy, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," for the sickness of his body was rooted in the central sickness of his soul; and he could never be well until forgiveness cleansed away the inner poison of guilt. He knew what men are just now scientifically discovering—the connection between sin and disease. He did not connect them always, of course, turning every sick man into a guilty man. Not that. But in this case He read the fact of their intimate connection and put His finger on the root. When the root was healed, the fruit was healed.

Had we no answer to the patient's question of whether God is love, we would have no answer to the world's hurt, but we do have that answer—and that answer is a Person. He did not prove that God is love. He showed that God is love. He did not bring the message of forgiveness. He WAS the message of forgiveness spelled out in act and fact.

Alongside the stinging nettle there is a healing dockleaf. If the world holds malaria, it also holds quinine; and if diabetes is in our world, so is insulin; and if guilt is deep planted in human nature, remember that the cross is planted deeper still—planted in the very nature of God and in the very nature of the universe, and that cross brings reconciliation with ourselves, with our brother, with Nature, and with God.

Remedy: Bring up the guilts without equivocation and by confession to God, and by restitution to man as far as possible, clean up the old sores and God's forgiveness will heal them. As Maeterlinck says: "In owning our faults we disown them, and in confessing our sins they cease to be ours." Then forgive yourself, for if God forgives you, you must do as much and forgive yourself. Then forget the canceled guilt, as you go singing your way down the years. See Chapter X regarding the possibility of a fresh page, a new start, a new person.

CHAPTER IX

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

THE CHINESE HAVE A CHARACTER FOR "PEACE" WHICH depicts a house roof and one woman under it. The character for "strife" or "contention" is the same house roof with two women under it! There is an agelong wisdom gathered up in those characters, not only regarding the home, but regarding the human personality in general. Where there is unity of devotion and purpose within the personality there is peace and consequent power, but where there is an inner division in loyalty and purpose there is inward strife and contention and consequent weakness and paralysis.

No more penetrating thing was ever spoken concerning human living, both in individual and in social phases, than the words: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Physically, mentally, spiritually, sociologically, economically, and politically this statement is an axiomatic truth as universally a fact as two and two make four. And yet in all these realms men are trying to disprove it—with disastrous results. The thing that Jesus was striking at, almost more than anything else, was this fact of inner division. He saw that men were trying to live in contradictory directions, upon contradictory principles, with divided loyalties. So He pronounced a doom upon all this living by the simple statement: A house divided against itself cannot stand—note the "cannot"—you are trying to do an impossible thing, something that is against the nature of things and therefore impossible.

A mother said to her little girl as she was all flustered and

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

flurried with indecision: "Now, hurry up, Mary, and make up your mind." To which the little girl replied with a sigh, "It's easy for you to make up your mind, mother, for you've got only one mind to make up, but I've got lots of minds to make up." The many minds meant inward collapse, for they canceled out each other.

There is a sign over an Express Agency in Shanghai which reads: "Your baggage taken and delivered in all directions." When the baggage of life is taken and delivered in all directions by a house of Man Soul divided against itself, there is no possibility of the soul having a pleasant journey. Most of his time and energy is spent in trying to gather together both himself and his baggage.

When Jesus uttered these words about the house divided against itself, He uttered them to the Pharisees. They themselves were what He meant by the futility of trying to live divided against oneself. They were not consciously bad men, living in conscious hypocrisy—they were simply men who were religious in compartments. A Hindu once told me that he had one room in his house where he did as he liked—there he was modern, ate meat, drank liquor, but when he stepped out of that room into the rest of the house he was orthodox and proper according to ancient ritual. He was trying to be two things at once, and that division in his house was the outward expression of the division in himself. The Pharisee was like that—he was trying to let religion function in certain compartments and not in others. A young man said to a friend of mine, "I am a Roman Catholic, but I don't let it influence my outlook on life." He really thought that was to his credit! As if it shouldn't influence his outlook on life! This compartmentalism is the central thing bringing paralysis to religious personality.

After Jesus had laid down the principles of the Kingdom in the first chapter in the Sermon on the Mount—loving your enemies and doing good to those who spitefully use you, ending up with

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

"Be perfect"—He then went on and laid bare the reason why men were failing to live this kind of a life. And the reason He gave was one: inward division. So He struck at this inward division in the following phases:

1. Don't try to give your alms with the divided motive of pleasing God and getting credit from men (Matthew 6. 1).

2. Don't pray to God and at the same time try to impress men with your sanctity (verse 5).

3. Don't fast before God and at the same time try to build up a reputation for asceticism (verse 16).

4. Don't try to make the best of both worlds by attempting to lay up treasure in two directions (verse 19).

5. Don't try to be divided in your loyalty by attempting to serve two masters—God and Mammon (verse 24).

6. Don't be anxious in two directions—today and tomorrow—concentrate on today (verse 34).

7. Don't try to judge in two directions—yourself and others—concentrate on yourself (7. 1-5).

8. Don't try to bring forth good fruit out of an evil heart (verses 15-18).

9. Don't try to give lip service saying, "Lord, Lord," without doing the will of God (verse 21).

If you try to live with a dual motive, He says, then there will be one sure result—you will be like a man building his house on sand, and when the pressures of life come—when the winds blow and the floods come—then there will be a crash; life will not stand up under it.

Here He was not preaching morality: He was simply expounding the way life works: if you try to live in this divided manner, then you don't live; for you are trying to live against yourself, and that won't work. All inward division has this doom upon it—it won't work.

Of course there is usually an attempt to build up in religion a system of thought and action by picking out certain things that

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

suit us and eliminating the rest. For instance, Jesus noted how the Pharisees picked out certain things and swore by them, allowing more important things to go by default. When they swore, they made certain things binding and other things not binding; when they swore by the Temple, it was not binding; but when they swore by the gold of the Temple, it was binding (Matthew 23. 16-18). Why? Well, they liked gold, they were interested in it, but not really interested in the Temple, the place of God's abode. They were interested in gold, not God, so one was binding and the other wasn't. They swore by gold. Then to swear by the gift on the altar was binding, but to swear by the altar was not binding. Why? Well, they were interested in gifts on the altar, for as religious leaders they received them finally. But they were not interested in the altar, for that was the place of giving—they were not interested in giving, but in getting. So they swore by the getting side of religion and let the giving side go.

If we think this is a predilection which is not prevalent today, then we are mistaken. We draw around ourselves a set of religious scruples which fit into our desires and reject the rest, or push them to the edges. "Ye tithe mint and anise and cummin and pass over justice and the love of God." Why? Because they were interested in tithes—for tithes finally came to them as religious leaders, but to take justice and the love of God would mean that they would have to share what they had with the underprivileged. They were not interested in sharing with the sheep but in shearing them, so they fastened on tithes and let go justice and the love of God. They did not reject them—that would be sacrilege, they simply "passed by" these things and slurred them over and emphasized what was emphatic in their own inner loyalty. They built up a system of religion which left them complacent and comforted, because neatly compartmentalized.

In a famous heresy case the man who fought it through and got the professor convicted of heresy no doubt had the feeling of satisfaction that he had defended the faith and saved it from

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

destruction. But after the professor had died, probably of a broken heart, the defender of the faith had a spiritual awakening which resulted in an awakening of conscience, so he confessed that, as he looked back, he saw that the real motive in prosecuting that heresy trial was that of revenge—the professor had flunked him twice in examinations when he was a student. He was divided between the defense of the faith and the defense of his wounded self, so he chose the first as giving a religious frontage to a concealed motive. But that house, divided against itself, collapsed under the smittings of awakened conscience.

In Madras there is the "Cosmopolitan Club," made up almost entirely of Brahmins, and the "Union Club," made up entirely of non-Brahmins. The words "Cosmopolitan" and "Union" satisfy their desire to feel broad and liberal and enlightened while the inner facts of being confined to a particular class satisfied their real desire for exclusiveness. There is a "Kagawa Club," whose main and apparently only function is to meet and eat. The name of Kagawa made them feel a sense of satisfaction that they were as sacrificial as Kagawa was.

In the early Church there were really two communions. One was the communion of the Bread and Wine in which they communed with the crucified and risen Lord. The other was the communion with each other in the breaking of Bread, a rite which was known as the "Agape," or Love Feast. This Love Feast was a very serious thing and had a profound meaning which went to the very center of human relationships. The second communion grew out of the first communion—as they were Brothers of the Bread so they extended this Brotherhood beyond the spiritual communion into an economic and social communion. As they were one at the place of the altar, they would be one at the place of the economic. The Brotherhood of the Bread was not confined to a momentary partaking of Bread in a sacred place, it would extend itself into a Brotherhood of the Bread in the ordinary partaking of bread for sustenance. "They distributed

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

according to each man's need" . . . for, "They had all things common." It was a Brotherhood of the One Bread. They were united in spiritual things, so they would be united in the material. There was no compartmentalism—life was under a central, unified control. The material and spiritual were under a single dominance.

They also belonged to the Brotherhood of the Blood. They partook of the one Blood in the Communion, so they belonged to the "one blood" in their social relations. They profoundly believed: "God hath made of one blood all nations." They had come into a Brotherhood of the One Blood—all relations built on superior and inferior blood were canceled and the solidarity of the new humanity was affirmed. "In Jesus Christ there is no room for Greek and Jew"—distinctions based on blood faded out. They belonged to the One Blood, and therefore to the "one blood." These two steps were the most momentous a group of people had ever taken in human relations: (1) the principle of unity would extend from the altar to the board. The Brotherhood of the Bread would not stop half way and function in the spiritual and draw back at the place of the material. (2) The Brotherhood of the Blood would not stop half way and function only in the spiritual and draw back at the place of the racial. It was one Bread and one Blood and there were no limits or hesitations. Life was unified. It was the most magnificent conception ever presented to the mind of man. Had the Christian Church remained true to this, it would have transformed the world, for men are looking for just such a unifying conception of life.

But what did the Christian Church do? We kept the communion with Christ and dropped the communion with each other. The Agape dropped out and the Eucharist remained. Why? Apparently for the reason that we could compartmentalize life at this place—we could commune with each other spiritually in a mystic communion at the altar, but there the communion would cease. We would co-operate at the place of the sacred Bread

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and compete at the place of the common bread. A wedge was driven straight into life—the most disastrous wedge ever driven into the soul of humanity. The pulling out of that wedge must now be the chief business of the Christian Church.

Simple people feel the connection between these two and feel they belong together. A missionary gave communion to some villagers in India for the first time. After he had distributed the bread, the headman got up and apologized to the people in these words: "The Saheb is traveling from place to place and it is therefore impossible for him to have more bread with him, and that is why he gave us such a little bit. I'll go and get some." So he went off and got some buns and distributed them saying: "Take, eat." The simple villager had the deep insight that the two breads were one. We must regain that insight.

Moreover, we stopped at the place of the one Blood—we would co-operate with other races at the Communion Cup, but not at the common cup. We would be brothers of each other; but not brothers-in-law! The Kingdom of God, which is color-blind, class-blind, and race-blind, became a kingdom which was color-conscious, class-conscious, and race-conscious. We drove a wedge into the body of humanity. We became a house divided against itself.

Again we divided the house of Man Soul when in the early Church we drove a wedge between the secular and the sacred. In the coming of the Holy Spirit life was fused into a living whole. All life was sacred, and all duties were done in Christ's name and spirit. But the apostles missed their step when they said that they would appoint men over the business of serving tables while they gave themselves to the word of God and to prayer (Acts 6. 1-4). Thus grew up a specially "sacred" class with sacred privileges. The laity would live only a second-best type of life with a second-rate outlook and spirit. This sent a sag through the whole thought and outlook of the laity and took away its sense of high mission. It also built up around the clergy a lot

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

of hocus-pocus of sacred tones and sacred dress and sacred lore—the clergy had to *appear* different, even if they were not. Life had a central division running through it. The house of Man Soul was divided against itself, and hence could not stand.

For the first three centuries of the Christian Church no Christian ever went to war and no soldier stayed in the army after he became a Christian. The soul of Christianity was unified at the place of the use of armed force—it was judged incompatible with the Christian way of life. Then with the conversion of Constantine no one except a Christian could get into the army. There Christianity brought into its inmost soul an incompatibility and divided itself against itself. This foreign substance brought into the body of Christianity has been a festering place through the ages. We have tried to naturalize war in the body of Christianity by softening it and trying to make it humane. But it cannot be done. As an army airman said to me, "War cannot be softened, it must be eliminated." It may be that a surgical operation will have to be performed, in which the infected parts are cut away to save the rest of the body. In any case, the alliance between Christianity and war must be broken if Christianity is to be saved. This is the gangrenous foot which must be severed to save the body, for it is better to enter the Kingdom of God maimed than that our whole body be thrown into the hell of inner division and infection.

Again Christianity tried to put within itself the incompatible element of selfish, ruthless, economic competition. We tried to naturalize it within the body of Christianity. Archbishop Whately said, "It is curious to observe how through a wise and beneficent arrangement of Providence men thus do the greatest service to the public when they are thinking of nothing but their own gain." Competitive capitalism and Christianity tried to come to a working alliance—Christianity would take over the severely spiritual portions of life and leave the economic and hence the social and political relations to a selfish struggle for profit. The

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

man of business became two men: on Sunday a man of co-operation and love and on Monday a man of competition and selfish accumulation. He was not a hypocrite—far from it. He was a victim of a division which Christianity took within itself. He tried to be two men at one and the same time—a Christian man with love and mutual aid as the driving forces of his life, and an economic man with selfishness and mutual elimination as the driving forces of his life. The awakened modern Christian is a very unhappy man, for he knows that he is a house divided against itself. He also knows that the social structure he has built up is a house built on sand—the storms and the floods are beating on it and he knows that the crash is imminent. It is a house divided against itself.

“Ye builded your thrones then,
On the bodies and souls of living men,
And think ye that the building will endure,
That shelters the rich and crushes the poor?”

Into the structure of world civilization we introduced the principle of Democracy. It was a right principle, and we should have applied it fearlessly to the whole of life. But we were afraid and applied it only to the political—one man, one vote. For years we hailed Democracy as the political Messiah. We did it as a woman did in Ceylon, when adult suffrage was introduced: she was seen to stand before the ballot box with folded hands saying her prayers to this new god, Democracy. But we soon found that this new god could be manipulated from behind the scenes and could be made to speak the voice of its masters. In Pompey they found the place at the back of the idol where the priest stayed and spoke through the mouth of the idol to the multitude assembled. The god of Democracy seemingly spoke the mind of the people, but really it spoke the voice of the vested interests which controlled things from the rear. We made the tragic mistake of

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

not introducing Democracy into the social and economic as well as into the political. Christianity is struggling with an "inner division" within itself—approving of the equality of all before the law, and at the same time approving of the inequality of economic opportunity and consequently of inequality of economic distribution. This division is creating havoc in all our relationships and is dividing the world into "haves" and "havenots." This white war of economic struggle at the basis of life turns into the red war of international clash. Christianity stood for the unified control of all life and should have resisted this division, but instead of resisting it, we baptized this division into the Faith. And we find we have a vast, selfish paganism as a member of the household of Faith. This paganism once introduced turns round and challenges the right of Christianity to live in the same house. If it doesn't put it out entirely, it does what the State did in Germany: it took away from the Church all social service activities, all orphan asylums, for orphans can be made into fighting citizens, and left the Church two things: spiritual worship and the care of the insane; the implication being that the lame in spirit and the lame in mind would be the special province of the Church. We let that camel's nose inside the tent, and now it tells the owner of the tent to get out, as there is no room for both.

When we come to the methods of bringing in the Kingdom we are again a house divided against ourselves. Jesus taught that love and love alone was the method. We doubt the efficacy of it and turn to force to overcome evil. We introduce force into the means hoping we can dismiss it in the end. But to our dismay we find that, introduced into the means it passes over into the end and corrupts the end. Anything gained by force must be held by force. "You cannot fight the devil with his fire without yourself getting burned." We cannot by some alchemy get the gold of brotherhood out of the base metals of hate and force. The only possible way to get rid of an enemy is to turn him into a

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

friend—and the only possible way to turn him into a friend is to be friendly, and to be friendly is to love him.

Sometimes we use the method of half-hate and half-love, alternating between the two. We alternately bare our teeth at our opponent and then offer to kiss him. And then we wonder why it does not work. We will have to make up our minds about the Christian means as well as the Christian end. At the place of the means we are a house divided against itself.

So today we are dealing with a very unhappy Christendom—unhappy because it is a house divided against itself. From the international down through the racial, the social, the economic, the religious to the inmost soul of the individual there is the fact of the house divided against itself, and hence unable to stand up under the stresses of life. Life is going to pieces because of its inner strains and contradictions. I was about to walk into a ruined Hindu temple when a priest warned me with these words: "Saheb, don't go in there, for the roof is seamed and cracked; a breath will bring it down." We are afraid that that fatal breath is now blowing on the structure of Christendom and that it may bring it down in an awful crash.

What is the remedy for this divided house of Man Soul? Obviously, it is the very thing which Christ specializes in, namely, conversion. For conversion introduces unity into a nature divided against itself. So the alternative before us is conversion or collapse.

The case of a house divided against itself on a vast scale is the League of Nations. Men were astonished beyond words when this seemingly noble structure collapsed so pathetically. It was a noble endeavor, but failed because of inner division. The nations wanted world unity but were unwilling to surrender national sovereignty. They thought they could have both—a unified world, capable of acting in a unified way and yet at the same time holding fast to the national self and refusing to surrender it to the larger whole. It was a League of *Nations*—the nation was intact and the nation was sovereign, there was no higher law than

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

the law of its sovereign will. A decision had to be unanimous or it would not be valid. When a decision went against a State, it simply withdrew. Each nation saved its life, it refused to surrender its national will to the collective will, refused to lose itself in a larger whole to find itself again in a world of unity. It tried to be a house divided against itself—a house wanting world unity and a house wanting a self-centered national sovereignty. The attempt was to do the impossible and hence the collapse. But in that collapsing it laid bare on a world scale the world principle upon which the League broke: the only way to realize yourself is to renounce yourself for a larger whole; then that self will come back to you purified of the contradictions and divisions—a self united, happy and effective. The League needed conversion—a change from self-centeredness to a whole-centeredness; and what the League needed we all need.

Of Socrates it was said: "Born many, he died one." We must live and die "one," or we really do not live.

CHAPTER X

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

OUR DISCUSSION HAS BEEN CONVERGING ON ONE NECESSITY—the necessity for some fundamental change within the man which will bring release from resentments, from fears, from selfishness, from a sense of guilt, from an inwardly divided condition. That is the negative side of the need. The positive side is the necessity of bringing that man out of the sense of aloofness, of estrangement, of emptiness, into fellowship with God, with himself, with his brother, and with nature. He needs something that will gather all life up into a central unity and give it purpose, meaning, direction, and wholeness.

Now, what the individual needs, society needs. It needs something that will gather up all life into a central unity and give it purpose, meaning, direction, wholeness. It needs a fundamental and basic change called conversion.

When we mention the necessity of a fundamental change, immediately we begin to think of the morally-in-the-gutter type of person to whom this should apply. It does apply to that man, for he desperately needs it, but it also applies to the men who find life turn dull and dead upon their hands—men who are outwardly keeping up appearances of moral respectability, but who feel inwardly empty. The case books of the modern psychologists are filled with corroboration of that statement. Listen to one of the greatest of them all, Doctor Jung: "About a third of my cases are suffering from no clinically definable neuroses, but from the senselessness and emptiness of their lives. It seems to me, how-

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

ever, that this can well be described as the general neurosis of our time. . . . Among my patients from many countries, all of them educated persons, there is a considerable number who came to see me, not because they were suffering from neurosis, but because they were finding no meaning in life, or were torturing themselves with questions which neither present-day philosophy nor religion could answer." Many a modern man answers the description of Isaiah:

"Many a mansion is to lie forlorn,

splendid and spacious and—empty!" (Isaiah 5. 9, Moffatt.)

Splendid in equipment, spacious in knowledge, but empty—that is the modern man. Said a successful modern man to me as he showed me his spacious house and grounds, "To a man like you this view is perhaps lovely, but to a mundane man like me it is very flat." He had expended his time and energy and money on his beautiful home and then found it all stale and flat. The reason was not in the outwardly lovely prospect, but in the inwardly lonely person. He was inwardly stale and flat. In one of my round-table conferences one Hindu put it this way: "I have been looking for thirty years for something to satisfy this inner longing, and the result is zero." A suicide left this letter: "I am committing suicide for I am tired of life, tired of inventing things to make me interested in life."

One of the deepest laws written within us is the law of completion. It is not merely that we feel wrong when we do wrong, we also feel wrong when the self is not completed. Within everything—from the lowest cell to the highest man, there is an urge after completion, after perfection. "Everything," says Tagore, "lifts up strong hands after perfection." If those hands are lifted in vain and man finds no secret of inner completion, there is central emptiness which brings a sense of guilt.

As a result of this inward emptiness, life is "tortured" with unanswered problems. The Indian sometimes dramatizes his inward confusions as in the following: A British official sat in his tent

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

outside an Indian village hearing court cases, when he looked out and to his surprise saw a man standing on his head outside his door. He dispatched a servant to find out the meaning of this strange procedure. The servant returned and reported that the man had replied: "Please tell the Saheb that my affairs are in such a topsy-turvy condition that I do not know whether I am standing on my head or my feet." The dramatic Easterner dramatizes his confusions while the more matter-of-fact Westerner simply bottles his up and suppresses them; but the terrible emptiness is there, both in East and West.

Just as I was about to speak to an audience of fifteen thousand people in an American city, I had thrust into my hand a note signed by "Two High School Girls," which read something like this: "You are our last hope tonight. We are confused and do not know how to live, so we have decided to end our lives. If you have any word to show us the way, then say it. But if you haven't, then we are through." As I spoke I did not see fifteen thousand people that night. I saw just two girls who were inwardly beaten, and my every breath was a prayer. It was the old story: one was taken and the other left—one took hold of the offer of Christ and rose out of her gloom and despair and is today on the road to usefulness. The other thought it too good to be true—and let go and sank.

Exactly the same kind of a letter, with its expressed intention of suicide unless I could help her that night, was sent up to me in India—this time from an Indian trained nurse. She nursed the sick back to health but her own heart was very, very sick. She eagerly responded to what I said, opened her heart to the power of Christ, and rose out of her meaningless misery and found release and power and integration.

Obviously, the human heart is the same in the East and West and has one need—the need of release from inhibition and fear and guilt and selfishness and meaninglessness. If religion cannot provide for this need, then it must be provided from other sources.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

A professor of a medical college in America said to me at the close of a meeting: "You are absolutely right about this need for conversion; for if you religious people cannot produce it, then we medical people will have to; for life demands it." In the midst of a great university, he saw that life had a central emptiness and wrongness unless a new fundamental change took place in the outlook and spirit of life. In other words, unless conversion took place. He saw that what really mattered when a young man finished his education was not what he knew, but what he loved; for if you love the wrong thing, then all life goes wrong with it.

If the medical profession is coming out at the place of the necessity of conversion, so is the business profession. A very successful management engineer who is called in to straighten out sick businesses told me that ninety-five per cent of the troubles in business were not in the business, but in the men who were running the business—wrong attitudes, wrong tempers, wrong motives—wrong people. He found that when he straightened out the men, the business took care of itself. So from a business standpoint he was driven into the necessity of trying to produce conversion in the personnel of the staff.

Conversion is the change of the master-sentiment. That change may come gradually, or suddenly. After making inquiries of many people in many parts of the world, I find that about forty per cent of those who have undergone a real change belong to the group of the "sudden," while about sixty per cent belong to the "gradual." The worth-whileness of this change cannot be judged by whether the change was gradual or sudden. Not the phenomena that surround it, but the facts that issue from it—this is the important thing. Whether gradual or sudden, it gives a man something outside himself to love. No, not something to love—*Someone* to love.

This necessity of finding Someone to love outside of oneself is deeply embedded in human nature. It is being increasingly discovered that only as we have an affection which lifts us out of our

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

pettiness, our selfishness, our fears and passions, do we find ourselves again. A rogue elephant is one that has been driven from the herd by the younger elephants, and, lacking the fellowship of the herd, he is unhappy, ill-tempered, and tears up gardens, wrecks the huts of the people and tramples them to death when opportunity arises. Why? Is he inherently "a rogue"? No, he has nothing to love, so he turns destructive. In the fellowship of the herd he would be different. When the human heart has no central love, it turns destructive, both to itself and others. Conversion gives it something to love supremely. But that something must not be itself. For to love oneself supremely is to lose oneself; and that not merely spiritually, but physically as well.

A doctor friend told me of a very intelligent, cultured patient in the hospital who had symptoms of appendicitis and a blood count up to eleven thousand when it should have been only five thousand to seven thousand. The doctor noted that the patient was disturbed over her sister's visit, for she had asked to be excused from seeing her. The doctor, sensing a mental cause for the symptoms, asked her about her relationships with her sister. He found that there had been an inheritance dispute, and she had got the major portion and had refused to let her sister have her just share. She loved the affluence it gave her and did not want to part with it. The doctor insisted that she see the sister and talk it through. Finally she did so and came to a just settlement with the sister. Immediately she said she felt better, the pain was gone and she was discharged from the hospital as cured. The doctor found that she had been operated on previously because of pain in the gall bladder, but nothing had been found. The fact is that the appendicitis pain and the gall bladder pain—both of them real pains, for she was not malingering—came from the fact of a moral conflict induced by her own selfishness. The pain left when the shift was made from a selfish to an altruistic basis. Today she is a different person. She had experienced a conversion.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

The need for conversion is written in our very constitutions. The psychologists have discovered it and are attempting to meet it. The psychoanalysts see that the basis of physical and mental upset is some conflict within. "Conflict of some kind is at the basis of all nervous disorders." Moreover, there can never be release until the source of that conflict is discovered and brought up into the open. As long as it is suppressed it will fester. It must be brought up and related to the rest of the life, so says the psychoanalyst. Was there ever a more direct and implicit corroboration of the Christian method than this? The Christian has asserted this for two thousand years—he has said that there is no health of soul or body as long as there is conflict within. And the Christian puts his finger on the source of the conflict and calls it sin. Sin is that which sets up a barrier within the man himself—and hence a barrier between the man and his brother and between man and God. That sin may be highly respectable, as in the elder brother of the parable—the sin of pride, of selfishness, of lack of forgiveness and a refusal of fellowship, or it may be low down sin, as in the younger brother—the sin of lust and appetite; in both cases it is disruptive and equally so, though the one is the more apparent. Sin is therefore no theological fiction, but a thoroughgoing friction, discovered by religion and psychology alike as being disruptive and disintegrating. We thought we had outgrown this concept of sin, we showed it the door and dismissed it—and lo, it has come back by the window. And it has come back more menacingly than ever before. If we no longer tremble at the base of some Mount Sinai which thunders to us, "Thou shalt not," we are nevertheless just as startled when we hear that same voice speaking in the silent depths of our own physical and mental structure, and the word is the same—"Thou shalt not." If we no longer quail before such sermons as Jonathan Edwards preached on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," nevertheless we are just as startled when we find that we are patients in the hands of an internal conflict. If an outer burning hell has

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

lost its terrors, nevertheless an inner burning hell of conflict and confusion has added new ones. We thought we had got rid of the Ten Commandments, an angry God and hell—and lo, they seem to have moved within us—we are wearing them within our own bosoms! The psychologist may call them by other names—complexes, inhibitions, neuroses, but these things by other names are not less poignant and pungent. The point is that they are now scientifically proved facts.

How does the psychoanalyst deal with them? He gets his patient to talk about himself, to bring into the open his hidden fears, sins, and shocks. As he talks about them they are supposed to be resolved and dissipated as mists before the rising sun of self-knowledge. Some of them are, but many of them are not. Here is where the psychoanalyst finds a limitation in his method. He hasn't an adequate motive and dynamic to give to the patient to lift him out of his slough of depression and conflict. The patient needs to know more than himself: he needs to know purpose and meaning and wholeness and fellowship—something to lift himself out of himself and make him forget himself in some all-consuming love and fellowship. This the psychoanalyst is seldom able to offer. Sometimes he offers himself as the trellis upon which the patient's vines of affection may grow—he allows the patient to fall in love with himself, at best a temporary, professional substitute for the real thing, a stone instead of bread.

The name of this process is called psychoanalysis, and it is rightly named—it is an analysis of the psyche. But analysis is not synthesis. It takes apart, but doesn't necessarily put together. Someone has said that "this age is suffering from the paralysis of analysis." It is a world that knows all about itself—knows everything except one thing: it doesn't know how to put itself together. Davies says: "The work of the late Alfred Adler and the school of individual psychology has removed a little of the veil covering the unconscious processes of the Will to Power. But most emphatically it hasn't destroyed it. One of the most cruel

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

illusions of psychoanalysis is that the process by which we become aware of our 'complexes' is also their dissipation and cure. Nothing can be further from the truth. Of all the disintegrated souls of contemporary society, none are so disintegrated as the psychoanalyzed."¹

This statement may be too strong, for many have been helped by psychoanalysis, but there is a truth in it. I have met a good many such disintegrated souls who were trying to grow the flowers of inward unity and wholeness in the pale moonlight of self-knowledge instead of the glorious healing sunlight of a God-knowledge. To change the figure: they were trying to lift themselves by taking hold of the hair of their own heads and lifting hard. The results have been disappointing. A book which describes "the neurotic personality of our time," ends with this sentence: "We may call him a stepchild of our culture." After picking him to pieces and labeling him, the author leaves him right there—a stepchild sitting helpless at the doorstep of our culture.

But we can use the method of psychoanalysis, remembering it is analysis and not synthesis. At the end of the analysis we will use our own synthesis. We have it ready. We have seen life gathered up into one central grand meaning—that meaning is Christ. We feel that He represents Life and only as lesser life gets into contact with Him does it live. We offer Him to the inwardly disrupted as the One who can put them together and can keep them together. For it is no temporary Pollyanna healing which He offers—He offers what men need so desperately, namely, forgiveness, reconciliation, assurance—assurance that at the heart of things is a Heart, that God loves and cares and His love will not let us go. Moreover, He offers no spiritual coddling as the remedy, for He offers the Kingdom of God as the strenuous Cause for which a man may live, and if necessary, die. The man

¹ D. R. Davies, *On to Orthodoxy*, p. 100. Hodder & Stoughton.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

now feels he is no longer orphaned, alone, estranged, he is related to Life and that Life is warm and tender and personal. When Jesus was hanging on His cross He did not say to John, "Now, please look after My mother." He did not lay on him a duty. Rather He established a relationship: "Son, behold thy mother;" and as soon as John saw and felt that relationship the duty flowed from it naturally. If he was a son, then, of course, he would take care of his mother. That incident lets us see the method of Jesus. He does not lay on us a set of rules and duties, rather He establishes a relationship—a relationship with God. He says to us, "Son, behold thy Father,"—He reveals God to us as a Father and man to himself as a son; and when once we grasp that central fact, then everything else flows from it, flows from it like a fountain from a hillside fed by eternal springs. Life now has infinite meanings, infinite goals, and infinite resources. And deepest of all, life has now an infinite fellowship, infinite and yet very personal, for it is all very personal in Christ.

This need of fellowship is seen by the psychoanalysts, so they often organize their patients into fellowships. For each needs an interest outside himself. But it is a fellowship of the sick with the sick, and the fellowship consequently must be sickly. In Christ there is the fellowship of the sick with Infinite Health. And there is nothing professional in it all. He offers Himself as the object of our love because He first loved us and gave Himself for us. It is all very, very real.

This inward integration and its resultant peace can be found in the simplehearted while the wise and prudent miss it. One of the great educationalists of India, principal of a college, was visiting America and a Negro youth was shining his shoes. The Negro youth looked into the handsome face of the Hindu and said very simply: "You've got a Christian face. You're a Christian, aren't you?" The Hindu was taken aback a bit, but managed to say that he was a Hindu and not a Christian, and then his curiosity aroused, he asked the Negro youth: "Why do you ask? Are

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

you yourself a Christian? Then tell me what makes you a Christian. Why are you a Christian?" The Negro boy's face began to light up as he told why he was a Christian. It was done so spontaneously, so simply and yet so effectively that the great educationalist was shaken to his depths. "I have listened to many sermons and lectures in my life," said the principal, "but I have never been so moved in my life as when that Negro boy shining my shoes told of what Christ meant to him. He had something I didn't have." And the great Hindu brushed away an unbidden tear as he said it. That Negro boy had found life's central secret—a fellowship with the living Christ.

The followers of Arabindra Ghose, the famous Hindu devotee, sent word to their Guru that they would assemble in Delhi at a certain hour, and he in Pondicherry would think of them at that hour and they would try to realize his presence. They reported that they actually did feel his presence. This was reported as noteworthy. And yet how very faint and momentary such a realization of the presence of one's Guru this is compared with this living Christ, who is not sending thought waves from a distant center, but is actually and positively with each soul who surrenders his will and life to Him. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them"—not as a remembrance, but as a realization, a fact.

But this love relationship cannot be set up on a sentimentalism, but on a surrender. There is no love without surrender. Between persons this is so. Carlyle says: "You cannot understand a person unless you do two things: surrender to that person and then identify yourself with them, or you know nothing about them." Where the self is withheld there is no love and no understanding. And there is no new birth without the change of the master-sentiment. All life is lifted by surrender to higher life. The mineral surrenders itself to the plant and is lifted and assimilated into a higher kingdom. The plant in turn surrenders itself to

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

the animal and is lifted to the Animal Kingdom. The Animal Kingdom surrenders itself to the man and is lifted into the higher Kingdom of Man. Man surrenders himself to the Kingdom of God and partakes of a higher kingdom. In each case there was a birth "from above." And this is what Jesus said must happen: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." In each case among the lower kingdoms the surrender was an involuntary surrender to the Kingdom above, but in the case of man the surrender is voluntary and chosen.

When the roots of the lotus flower come down into the foul mud to lift it to the Kingdom of Purity, the foul mud has to do two things: it must be willing to cease to be mud and it must surrender itself to the life of the plant. We too must surrender the kingdoms in which we find ourselves—sometimes one by one and sometimes all in a lump, but we must surrender them. And then we must be willing to be taken hold of by the Supreme Kingdom, the Kingdom of God, and be molded into its life and outlook.

There are seven kingdoms which every man must surrender if he is to see the Kingdom of God. First, there is the Kingdom of Race. Pride and privilege and presumption are built up into the conception of race. We think we belong to a superior race and must therefore have superior privileges. But if we are to get into the Kingdom of God in which there is "no Greek or Jew"—racial distinction—then we must renounce the Kingdom of Race, refuse to be governed by its presumptions and dictates, and wash our hands of its privileges and stand as a person stripped of all except one's human personality and knock at the door of the Kingdom of God. Otherwise there is no entrance.

Then, too, there is the Kingdom of the Nation. Many make it supreme, and the modern State often tries to make itself supreme, an absolute. But when a relative thing becomes an absolute thing, then there is idolatry. No Christian can give his final allegiance to the State. His final allegiance is to the Kingdom of God, the

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

absolute. I will give everything to my country except one thing—my conscience. That conscience bows at one place and only at one place—the Kingdom of God. Our country recognizes that it has no right to coerce the conscience, so it recognizes the right of anyone to be a conscientious objector. He has a legal standing, and this should be recognized by everybody. His patriotism cannot be questioned on the ground that he is a conscientious objector. His standing is as firm as any other citizen, for a civilized State recognizes something beyond itself to which it and the individual is amenable, the Kingdom of God. Therefore, the Kingdom of the State must be surrendered and it must be obeyed only as it obeys something higher than itself, the Kingdom of God. Said a Swiss lady to a very Christian English lady: "I think you are primarily a Christian and secondarily a Briton, but I'm afraid I'm primarily a Swiss and secondarily a Christian." The State must lose itself in the will of God to find itself again. As members of that State we must surrender the State and make our allegiance to God primary.

Then there is the Kingdom of the Religious Community, the Church. It too will have to be surrendered in order to be found. It is not an absolute—the Kingdom of God is. It is not an end—the Kingdom of God is. Anyone who holds the Church first is guilty of idolatry. When the Church centers itself on itself, like the individual it loses itself. "He that saveth his life shall lose it" and this means the group as well as the individual. One will never know the glory and beauty of the Church until it is surrendered to the Kingdom of God. Then it comes back to one purified and related and found. Our loyalty to our Church must bend the knee to something higher—the Kingdom of God.

Then there is the Kingdom of Class which must be surrendered. The Kingdom of Class gathers into itself distinctions and privileges and exclusivenesses. These become sacrosanct, often obtaining religious sanction. When we fight for so-called principle, we are often merely fighting for class privileges. No one can enter

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

the Kingdom of God who holds on to his class privileges, for the Kingdom of God cancels all these false distinctions.

Then there must be a surrender of the Kingdom of Money. Around possessions are built up privileges and presumptions. A false world of values is built up, and we take it for granted that they are real and lasting. This false world of material value Jesus calls mammon. And He said that it must be surrendered: "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." This demand cuts straight across the whole mind-set of this age. "There is no place for a successful business man in Christianity," said a business man rather sadly at the close of one of my addresses. Quite true, if by the successful business man one means the person who is dominated by material values and interest. It is according to which is first—God or material value. Possessions are all right in the hand, but wrong in the heart. They must be surrendered and placed at the disposal of the will of God. The knee must no longer bow at the shrine of the Kingdom of Mammon. Its standards and interests must no longer dominate the life. The great renunciation must be made—the Kingdom of God must be first, last, and always.

Then there must be the surrender of the Kingdom of the Family. The Family is right if it is in the right place, but the right place is not the first place. When the Kingdom and the Family claims clash, there must be a giving way of the Family claim. To surrender the Family may be like cutting off the right hand; but if it must be then it must be. The Kingdom is absolute and brooks no rivals.

Then we come down to the central citadel of all—the Kingdom of the Self. That is the last thing we ever let go, for it is the one thing we seem to possess. Seem to possess? Yes, but only "seem," for the self of the self-centered man slips through his fingers, is lost, disintegrated and unhappy. Jesus revealed this fact when He said: "Whoever wants to save his life, shall lose it" (Matthew 16. 25, Moffatt). Note he doesn't save it, he "*wants*"

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

to save it, but actually he does not do so; for it is against the nature of things. This is so until it is surrendered and lost in the will of God, and then it is found again. That self may be full of conflict and anxiety and fear and guilt when it is surrendered, but it rises from that surrender inwardly unified, with anxiety and fear gone and reconciliation and forgiveness in place of guilt. A new man emerges out of the old chrysalis. A sign over a chiropractor's office says: "Limp in and Leap out." The equivalent of that happens. We limp into His presence as a lame soul and leap out as healed.

"But," objects someone, "I do not like your word 'surrender.' It smacks of an escapist mentality, a fear to live, a desire to turn the responsibility for one's life over to someone else." These are the very words of a puzzled youth to me. I could answer: "You misunderstand me. I want you to surrender to Christ but to nothing else. You bend low at the feet of Christ, but you stand straight before everything else. You bend before neither fear, nor sin, nor race, nor class, nor money, nor family, nor yourself. You are God's free man. You walk the earth emancipated." Moreover, you do not now surrender to bodily disease so readily. The soil in which these diseases flourish now ministers to the new life, so we are now immune to many of them. We throw them off. They say ninety per cent of the disease germs that fall upon a healthy skin perish in ten minutes—killed by health.

Dr. Richard Waterton says in a personal letter: "Dishonesty, impurity, selfishness, etc., are the background which seem to make the soil suitable for disease. Drugs will often stop the pathological process when the soil is helping the disease; but sometimes not. One of my patients did not react to drugs which had cured the majority of cases of this disease I had treated previously. He was in a depressed state of mind due really to a consciousness of impurity in his immediate past. He got release when he told me the whole story and something was born in him when he obeyed his guidance to tell two persons close to him (and whom it con-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

cerned deeply) about the matter, admitting his sin and his resolve to lead a Christian life. His disease cleared up completely in a very short time." Note two things here: "Something was born in him; . . . his disease cleared up completely." The connection between the two is very close—a healthy soul tends to produce a healthy body.

The doctor continues: "An uncertain and anxious frame of mind produced headaches and fits in a man which were cured when sin in his life came into the open and he got back to the right track. His uncertainty and anxiety were the result of a wrong relationship which he was intending to get on a proper basis, but he needed courage to face up to doing something about it. He got courage when he started listening to God, and he had no more headaches."

"Another man was overcome by a feeling of inferiority and failure to such an extent that it had almost become an obsession and had certainly produced a mental state which had resulted in a series of minor ailments. His start was made when he consented to write to his parents and apologize for what he had done to break up the home. I saw him six months later fight through a really serious illness with a determination which had not been in him before."

The doctor ends in these words: "I would class worry, anxiety, and uncertainty with fear and anger as being expressions of sin in the depths of a man, and it is this sin which the Kingdom of God casts out. It seems necessary that this sin must be brought up by confession and sharing. Then life is shifted from oneself to God—this is how it seems to work."

In each of these cases the outer rim of difficulty—physical upset and disease—was cured when the center was taken care of by conversion. To try to cure those diseases without going to the central need of spiritual healing is like treating a suppurating appendix by a change of climate.

Wolfe, the psychologist, said to women, urging them to keep a

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

zest of life after middle age: "Wear a red hat, or a gardenia corsage, or take an interest in the League of Nations, or develop a new consciousness of God." This advice represents something of the superficiality of our age: if women wore red hats all the time, you would get sick of them and the women would too; gardenia corsages soon fade; the League of Nations has become a dead issue since he proposed this remedy—all of these are ephemeral and any reconstruction of life based on them is bound to be momentary and ephemeral. Only one serious proposal is made: Get a new consciousness of God. That new consciousness of God involves moral and spiritual conversion. So psychology, following the facts of life, demands something akin to Christian conversion. Says Dr. Stanley Hall, the psychologist, "Every life is stunted unless it received this metamorphosis in some form or other. If the Church allows this to fossilize, then psychology, when it becomes truly biological, will preach it. Indeed, the chief fact of genetic psychology is conversion—a change of momentous scientific importance and interest." Conversion then is no theological dogma but a teleological demand. Life cannot do without it. It is rooted in the necessities of our natures and life is stunted without it. Starbuck says that "conversion is a normal adolescent phenomenon"—that is, if the adolescent remains normal, if he doesn't become stunted and infantile. If he does not go on to this moral and spiritual change, there is a retrogression, a "throw-back" into infantile attitudes. Men often are grown up in body, partly in mind, but in emotional and moral life they are infantile. Holman, discussing infantilism, says that the first sign of infantilism is "the inability of the individual to release himself from the control of elemental impulse. . . . A second sign of infantile fixation is the tendency to react emotionally against, instead of to deal intelligently with, new and changing situations. . . . The third evidence of emotional infantilism in religion is self-centeredness. . . . Now, it is clear that multitudes of people otherwise grown up are little children in this important respect.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Their judgment upon the course of events is determined by their private interests. They cry out petulantly: 'Why did this have to happen to me?' when some disaster affects their personal fortunes."²

Starbuck is right when he says that, "No one can come into adult emotional life without conversion." Or, as another puts it: "If conversion does not take place, then life is on a lower level—undeveloped, stunted." Newman puts it this way: "In a higher world it may be different, but in this world to live is to change and to be perfect is to change often." The most fundamental change is the change called conversion. Conversion is the gradual or sudden changing from the Kingdom of Self to the Kingdom of God through the grace and power of Christ.

William James says that conversion produces "firmness, stability, equilibrium succeeding a period of storm, stress, or inconsistency." The soul grows up—sometimes suddenly grows up from infantilism to maturity. He stands up under the pressures of life and is able to live and to live victoriously.

According to Wieman, there are three types of conversion: 1. Mediocre or limited conversion. 2. Pseudo conversion. 3. Supreme conversion. By limited conversion, he means conversion that is limited in its effects—the conversion extends to certain areas of life and leaves others untouched. For instance, it functions in the individual but not in the social. Pseudo conversion is an emotional experience, which results in no unifying of the life. The emotions are stirred but the life is unchanged. Supreme conversion is to undergo that transformation of interests and loyalties by which one can live for the highest fulfillments, not only for his time, but for the highest fulfillments for all time. Life is now grown up with a grown-up goal and grown-up resources. James is right when he says that conversion has produced the finest qualities that human life has shown on this planet.

² *The Religion of a Healthy Mind*, pp. 8, 9, 11, 13. Round Table Press, Inc.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

For, according to James, again: "Conversion produces these four fruits: 1. A sense of a higher and friendly Power. 2. Charity and brotherly love. 3. A paradise of inward tranquillity. 4. Purity of life;" and, we may add, a new sense of the value of ourselves. An inner, royal dignity comes into the human breast. The human heart has found itself and its way to live.

Inferiority complexes, which are at the back of so much mere half-living, are cured more radically by conversion than by anything else. A man can never despise himself again, for God does not. He is reconciled with God and hence with himself. Moreover, life becomes creative. "It is a creative and an inaugural experience." Noncreative human nature becomes contributive and creative. Anne Byrd Payson had created nothing until she was past sixty. As she put it, "I was fashionable, fleshy, and futile." Then came what she calls her "shining hour." She says that she sat in meditation before the fireplace after being up all night to read, *The Christ of the Indian Road*, and, "I opened my heart, and a warm living Presence came into it, and I was simply lifted out of the old life of fashion and futility." She had disliked the Jews and, "Now, strangely, I wanted to meet them." . . . "I had never done anything in my life, and now I wanted to create." She has done so: two remarkable books have been created: *I Follow the Road* and *The Rule of the Road*. Moreover, people seek her out to have her help them with their spiritual problems. Up to sixty—futility; beyond sixty—fertility. Truly, conversion is a creative and inaugural experience.

Even a man like Mussolini sees that if such a thing as we are describing were possible, it would be the only revolution worth having. Because he doesn't believe it possible he turns to the lesser and destructive revolution of force. This is what he says: "There is no revolution which can change human nature. If such a thing existed, it would be the only revolution worthy of the name, because it would reach down to the primary forces and

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

acquisitive instincts which dominate human activities, and would change them."

There are many who feel with Mussolini that human nature is unchangeable. Nothing could be further from the truth. Listen to Professor Hocking: "Human nature is the most plastic part of the living world, the most adaptable, the most educable. Of all animals it is man in whom heredity counts for least, and conscious building forces for most. Consider that his infancy is longest, his instincts least fixed, his brain most unfinished at birth, his powers of habit-making and habit-changing most marked, his susceptibility to social impressions keenest—and it becomes clear that in every way Nature, as a prescriptive power, has provided in him for her own displacement. . . . To anyone who asserts as a dogma, 'Human nature never changes,' it is fair to reply, 'It is human nature to change itself.'" This is from an outstanding philosopher. Now let us listen to one of the most significant sociologists of Europe: "A static psychology which conceives of 'man in general' on the basis of what he is today is on the wrong track. . . . It is by no means true that we have to deal with a given human type and hence must order our society to the dictates of an immutable human nature. . . . We can be helped only by interdependent action which makes use of both the internal and the external approaches in the sense that they combine at every step the transformation of society with the transformation of the individual personality."⁸ Christ recognizes this fact, and it is just this that He undertakes to do—and He *does* it! He does it to the degree that men allow Him to do it.

If it doesn't happen, then there is something wrong in the surrender. We don't let God have full control, but we nevertheless expect a full conversion. The Chinese adage says, "You cannot expect to put out a fire in a wagon-load of hay with a dipper

⁸ Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society*, pp. 200, 204, 227. George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., London.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

full of water." One lady in our Ashram, after battling with futility for years, said, "I believed in surrender, but not too much." She passed through this stage of futility to fruitfulness by believing in surrender sufficiently to make it complete. She found complete deliverance. A Presbyterian elder who had lived a life of barrenness said after his deliverance, "I used to be comparatively pure, relatively honest, intermittently unselfish, and approximately loving." No wonder these halting hesitations work out into half-way living—and half-way dying!

Is this method of surrender, however, psychologically sound? It is not only psychologically sound—it is sound as a life principle everywhere. The famous statement of Huxley to Kingsley is to the point: "Science seems to me to teach, in the most unmistakable terms, the Christian conception of entire surrender to the will of God. Science says, Sit down before the facts as a little child; be prepared to give up all preconceived notions; be willing to be led anywhere the facts of nature will lead you or you will know nothing." This method of self-surrender, then, is not something introduced by religion to minister to weak and fearful souls who are afraid to live. It is something inherent in the very process of knowledge, something without which we simply know nothing anywhere. Be proud and self-sufficient and unbending and the universe is a sealed book to you. Surrender yourself to the facts as a little child and everything is open to you. It is no mere chance that all the great scientists are men of humility, of simplicity. They simply had to be to become great scientists. This principle of self-surrender to the will of God, of willingness to listen to God and be led as He reveals His will is in line with the method of discovery of truth in nature and history. "He that is willing to do the will of God shall know of the teaching" is absolutely sound. There is no other way to know except by a willingness to *do*. Mannheim, as a sociologist, says in corroboration: "From a scientific point of view, it is very wholesome to make clear once more the creative significance of action and to

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

realize that only a new type of action can give birth to a new type of thought. This spirit has borne fruit in education, as can be seen in the attempt to replace the older abstract type of sermonizing by a new technique of transformation."⁴ It is easier to act yourself into right thinking than to think yourself into right acting.

In a moral universe the deepest method, the only method, of knowledge is moral response. The idea that belief is a set of intellectual conceptions apart from action is false. The word "belief" comes from "by-lief," or "by-life"—the thing you live by. Your beliefs, then, are the things you believe in sufficiently to act upon, to live by. The unity of theory and practice is a fact. Your theory is your practice, the only theory you have. So when we talk about surrender to the will of God, we do not talk about acquiescence to the will of God, a kind of passive acceptance of whatever comes to us—not that—but a positive bringing of everything in one's life into line with the will of God and then actively co-operating with that will as it is revealed to us in every phase of our lives.

That surrender is like being married. It is absolute—once and for all, but it is also unfolding. We say one complete and final "Yes," but many little "yes-es" come out of that big *Yes*. This surrender is final, but it is unfolding. It is done once for all, and yet, in a sense, it is never done. This too is psychologically sound.

Moreover, the method by which Christ undertakes to keep a man adequate, integrated, and useful is psychologically sound. Paul caught His method in a remarkable passage where sin is presented in three phases and the remedy proposed in one phrase: "There is no room" (see Colossians 3. 5, 8, 11, Moffatt). In the first passage we are told to put off five things: "sexual vice, impurity, appetite, evil desire, and lust" (verse 5). All five of these refer to the physical appetites. Here temptation meets us through the body. And many succumb at this place—at the outworks of

⁴ Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society*, p. 206.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

the human soul, the bodily appetites. They are beaten at the first trench.

But when we are victorious at this place, very often the temptations move on to a higher plane and become more subtle and refined. So the apostle speaks of a second set of sins, also five in number: "Off with anger, rage, malice, slander, foul talk!" (verse 8.) These five sins are what Drummond called "the sins of disposition"; they have reference not to bodily appetites but to the temper of the mind, the characteristics of the disposition. Many a person who disdains to fall into the sins of the flesh falls into these sins of the disposition, for they are more respectable. The sins of the flesh are out-caste, but the sins of the disposition are Brahmin, high-caste sins. They are often the sins of religious people, for anger and malice can be so easily cloaked in the garments of religious principle and can be made to appear respectable, even righteous. Many people fall at this second trench. They fight off the fleshly appetites, but succumb to bad tempers, to littleness of soul, to unwillingness to forgive injuries, to attitudes of contempt, to harsh words and gossip. Some are beaten at the second trench.

Many would stop here and say that sin ends here—there are just two kinds: sins of the flesh and sins of the disposition. That is the attitude of individualism. But the apostle puts his finger on another set of five sins, this time social sins: "In it there is no room for Greek and Jew [race distinction], circumcised and uncircumcised [religious communal distinction], barbarian, Scythian [cultural distinction], slave or free man [economic distinction]," "male and female [sex distinction]" (verse 11). (I have imported this last from the parallel passage in Galatians 3. 28.) Here we find the emphasis on the temptations to social sins. Many who are victorious at the place of individual sins fall at the place of the social sins: Race exclusiveness, Religious communal contentments, Cultural pride, Economic assumptions, and Sex superiorities. At the place of social sins there is going on a deepening of

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

moral conviction, and the conscience of the human race is being slowly but surely educated—with many a throw-back and many a revolt, as at present, but nevertheless we are seeing and feeling as never before social sin as sin. We see that to look down on anyone because of race or color is a sin against the God who made all races and all colors; to exclude one because he is not of our religious affiliation is to set up false barriers, and so to sin; because we have been able to buy culture through economic opportunity and privilege, and to think that we are thereby necessarily superior to those who could not buy these cultural privileges is to sin; to think because we have more wealth than others we thereby should have more privileges, is to sin; to think that we belong to a superior sex and must be served as such is to sin.

All three of these types of sin must be laid aside: the sins of the flesh, the sins of the disposition, and the social sins. Be laid aside? But how? That is the rub. It is easier said than done. What is the Christian method to face these three stern facts of temptation? It is simple and thoroughgoing and sound: "There is no room." These sins are not to be fought against one by one and conquered. We know now that psychologically this is a false method. "Whatever gets your attention gets you," and if your sins get your attention, even if it be a fighting attention, they will get you. So many people fall into the very temptations they are fighting, and wonder why this is so. The psychology is bad. The attention must be called away, become absorbed in something that takes one's attention and love; then there is what Bushnell called "the expulsive power of a new affection." In other words, "there is no room." The Christian answer to the problem of the conquest of sin is not to set a man fighting with clenched fists and set jaw and with an inner tenseness; rather, it suggests the opposite: don't fight, surrender—surrender to God; and as you surrender love will spring up and that love will become all-consuming, so that there is now "no room." You will simply not want your old sins, they will seem hideous and impossible in the light

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

of this glorious new fact of God which has come into your life. There is no room.

I stayed in the home of a very cultured man as a guest and was accommodated in his own room in his absence. In the hurry of going away he left things just as they were. Everything in the whole house had the air of respectability and decency except his small dressing room. The walls of this were filled with the lewdest of pictures. Back in behind an outer front of respectability there was this filth in the inner room—symbol of what is happening in many lives. I had to take them all down from the walls and pile them in the corner before I could live in the room. That was one remedy: take down all the pictures. But really it was not sufficient. A friend found a student with his walls filled with filthy pictures, but instead of scolding him he presented him with a very lovely picture of Christ to hang on the wall. The student hung it on the wall amid the lewdness and then found it wouldn't work, so he took down the lewd pictures and kept Christ. Now there was "no room."

I mentioned the five great Kingdoms: The Mineral Kingdom, the Vegetable Kingdom, the Animal Kingdom, the Kingdom of Man, and the Kingdom of God. These represent the five stages of life. Man stands between the Kingdom of the Animal and the Kingdom of God. To solve his questions on the level of the human, man often turns back to the lower kingdoms for a solution.

Some turn back to the level of the Vegetable Kingdom for a solution. They try to get rid of low desires by desirelessness. They want nothing and hence cannot be disappointed. They try to reduce life to the level of the vegetable and call it victory. This is the attempt of both Hinduism and Buddhism: cut the root of desire, even for life, and life's problems are solved. But Nature has her Nemesis. Desire put out of the window comes back at the door. There is no possible way to get rid of one desire, except to replace it by a higher desire. Surely God hasn't given

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

us a personality to cancel it out into desirelessness, even if it were possible. To be desireless would be to be fireless—life would sink into an ash. The two most ardent Buddhist countries of the world, Ceylon and Burma, have the highest murder rate of the world. Desire suppressed springs into inordinate passion. The mild East Indians attempting to be more mild, even to desirelessness, have more riots than any other people of the world. Desirelessness won't work—except havoc. You cannot solve the questions of the human by turning back to the level of the vegetable. A Western lady who was a vegetarian was accosted by a Hindu, all smiles, with these words: "Oh, madam, I hear you are a vegetable." Some people are trying to be just that, but it can't be done. Life vegetates but it cannot get to the vegetable. To be a vegetable is no refuge—not for a man.

Then others turn back to the level of the Animal Kingdom for the solution of the problems of the human level. When Darwin discovered the methods of survival in lower nature, his teacher and mentor warned him against what might happen—men might think these laws of survival in lower nature were the laws of survival on the human level. He pointed out that life survives on the human level by fitting into a moral universe which emerges on this level. Darwin, a religious man, never dreamed that his discoveries of the law of survival on the lower level would be adopted by man as the law of survival on the human level. But that is exactly what has happened. We have looked below for the method of survival and we have sunk as we have done so. If nature is red in tooth and claw, then we as nations will be the same—we will sharpen our national tooth and claw and we will survive by the same methods as lower nature. This attitude has been more or less adopted by all Western and many Eastern nations, but they have done it more or less apologetically, giving the excuse that others are doing it, so they of necessity do so. The inner influence of Christianity brought on the hesitations and the apologies. It remained for Fascism to adopt openly and unasham-

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

edly naturalism as its code of morals. Fascism is a naturalism and a naturalism of lower nature, frankly and avowedly so. It is a turning back to lower nature to solve our human problems. I listened to a Japanese lady interpreting over the radio the war aims of Japan, in the midst of which she said: "We in Japan do not believe in right and duty—they are Occidental ideas—we believe only in living and in helping others to live." The last phrase, "helping others to live," seemed to be dragged in by the ears. Ask China! But she was absolutely right about the primary aim of Fascism, for Japan has gone Fascist. Its aim is to live—regardless of morals; the only morality is that which gets you to your goal. It is life born from below with all its ruthlessness and aggressiveness. For a while it succeeds, but it soon breaks itself on the moral facts of the universe. Response to environment is the key to survival, and now man is in an environment of moral qualities and must survive by response to that—or perish. These laws close in on him and, sooner or later, break him if he breaks them. Fascism will have its day—a brief, bloody day—and then cease to be. It is trying an impossibility, for man can exist as man, not as an animal. You cannot turn to the level of the Kingdom of the Animal to solve the problems of the level of the Kingdom of Man. Red ruin lies in that direction and red ruin particularly for those who try it.

Marxian Communism is an attempt to solve the problems of life on the human level by a humanism. It is scientific humanism. It dismisses the higher kingdom, the Kingdom of God, and concentrates on the human. It is a higher attempt than the attempt of Fascism. Its remedy is nobler than the Fascist remedy. But it is showing very definitely that you cannot solve the problems of life on a human level without a Higher Reference. If you do not look up, you will soon look down. Marxian Communism in Russia is showing the same naked and brutal aggression as Fascism. Since it would not be born from above, it must, of necessity, be born from below. If you try to be human and only

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

human, you will soon be less than human. If you do not go up, you will go down—and Communism is going down, not up.

The hope of human life is to be born from above—the Kingdom of God. Individually and collectively, we must look up, not down. And we must not only look up, we must surrender to the Kingdom of God as it confronts us in Christ; then and then only will life respond to its real environment, and then and then only will it survive. We cannot get rid of the impulses of lower nature which beat within our pulses unless we find a new inheritance from above. God's life must be engrafted into our lower life—then and then only can we have Life; otherwise we have only life—life subject to decay and disintegration. This Higher Kingdom invaded the lower kingdom by Incarnation—we have seen the Higher Kingdom in the face and character of Jesus Christ. He it is who stands and says, "Ye must be born from above." And there is no escaping from that "must," unless we desire to escape from Life itself. This is what is called a "forced option"—an option like eating. You do not have to eat, but if you don't eat, you won't live. You need not take the new birth from above, but if you don't take it, you won't live—not really.

The remedy, then, is to replace the lower impulses by the expulsive power of a higher affection until "there is no room." The ancient Greeks in their mythology illustrated this when they invented the story of the Siren sisters, who upon their island sang so bewitchingly that mariners drawing near to listen had their ships dashed to pieces upon the rocks. Many tried to get by this enchanted isle by various devices. One had his ears filled with wax so he could not hear. Another had himself lashed to the mast and commanded his sailors under no condition were they to allow him to get loose. A third brought on board Orpheus, the divine musician, who sang and played so wonderfully that the voices of the seductive singers were drowned out—drowned out by a sweeter song.

There are three ways to get past the Isle of Temptation: One is

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

by doing the equivalent of filling your ears with wax—determining to shut out the voices by various mental and mechanical devices. This is good, but not good enough. Then there is the method of binding yourself with pledges and promises, lashing yourself to some mast of a fixed determination. This is also good, but not good enough, for in the face of temptation we break our promises as Samson did the green withes upon him. Pledges do not pledge us deeply enough, for the subconscious mind does not accept the pledge. So it arises and upsets all our good resolutions.

There is only one real remedy: Get a sweeter song on board. Have something on board your life so divinely sweet that the notes of sin sound like a discord. To change the figure: Fall in love with One so beautiful that sin loses its dimpled cheeks and looks like a repulsive hag in comparison. Then you no longer fight your sins—you simply do not want them. They have dropped off as a dead leaf before the rising sap of a new abundant life. You have nectar, so you cannot now be tempted by watery skim milk. You have bread, so you cannot be led away by the offer of a stone. There is no room!

This method of lifting life into higher life is psychologically sound, but one matter has to be discussed before we finish the subject. The question arises, Does not this mean the displacing of human effort and even of human faculties by the Divine? Is human life enveloped and swamped rather than developed and strengthened by this method? Our reply is that the natural instincts are not eliminated but are converted and sublimated to higher ends. The drive of these instincts is still there, but the direction has changed. For instance, the self-instinct is still there and is still operative, but not now for its own ends. As Davies says, "Not all self-assertion is egoistic. There is a self-assertion that can be altruistic and objective." This altruistic and objective self-assertion is a definite fact when the self is converted from its own ends to the ends of others. The self is not wiped out—it is heightened and strengthened and made more creative than ever.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

There is a place for ambitious men in the Kingdom of God. Jesus said, "Whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." He did not turn the man away from the ambition to be great. He simply told him how ambition can be fulfilled—become the servant of all.

Moreover, there are degrees of this greatness: if you want to be great, be "the servant of all"; if you want to be "first," be the "bond-slave of all." The servant and the bond-slave represent degrees of self-giving, and they, in turn, represent degrees of greatness attained, namely, "great" and "first." Beyond that is a degree which He mentions as His own: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." In other words, since He went deeper than "being servant of all" or a "bond-servant of all," in that He gave His life a ransom, so He becomes the Son of man, which is more than being "great," or "first," among a group—it is to be the acme of being. So the door is open for ambition. You can be "great" or "first."

But here ambition has had taken out of it a selfish jostle for place and is fulfilled as a by-product of a great dedication. Paul puts it in these words: "Make the edification of the church your aim in this desire to excel" (1 Corinthians 14. 12, Moffatt). Here competition—the desire to excel, is no longer harnessed to destruction; it is harnessed to construction. The drive is still there—the destructiveness of that drive is gone.

It is the same way with the sex urge. The sex urge is not suppressed or wiped out when we come under the law of the Kingdom. It is directed toward the end of consecrated physical procreation; or, where the opportunity for that is denied, or not desired, it is sublimated into creative activity, giving birth to souls, to new movements for human uplift and redemption and to right human impulses in general. The converted are the creative. From the moment that the impulse came into Andrew's heart to share with Simon what he had seen in the face of Jesus,

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

down to the present moment, this stream of creative activity has been the most beneficent that has touched our planet. There is nothing like it in human history. It is a deathless impulse. When Paul speaks of "by all the stimulus of Christ," he expresses that creative stimulus which comes from contact with Christ giving birth to a new energy, a new enthusiasm, and a new dynamic.

Then the herd or social instinct is also fulfilled. That instinct is expressed in a loyalty to the ultimate social order, the Kingdom of God. The converted finds himself in a brotherhood made up of human beings who are under the process of redemption—human beings made up of every class and race and color. To this new emerging humanity he is loyal with a growing loyalty. His old prejudices against races and classes and colors drop gradually, sometimes suddenly, in a mighty influx of love, and he finds himself looking on a person as a person, a person "for whom Christ died."

As I was about to leave Doctor Carver, the great Negro scientist, we stood in the center of his little "den," and joined hands with both hands and prayed for each other. I had spoken to him about a biochemist whom I had recently met who could find nothing in life except a certain combination of chemicals. The Negro scientist, looking out from his deep-set eyes, exclaimed over and over, "The poor man, the poor man!" And when I looked into the face of this aging saint and scientist in one, and remembered what he had done, not only for his own race but for the white man as well, I knew in my heart of hearts that this was the only comment to make, "The poor man!" For the other scientist was poor compared with this man—poor in achievement, poor in faith, poor in inner resources, and really poor in personality. For this man had produced out of the peanut three hundred commercial products, and out of the sweet potato one hundred and fifty commercial products, and in many ways he "rebuilt the agriculture of the South." Edison offered him an immense salary to come and help him, but he declined, and he declined another offer from a

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

firm of a hundred thousand dollars—he would give himself to the remaking of the agriculture of the South. Out of that peanut he made axle-grease, face powder, printers' ink, milk, cream, butter, shampoos, creosote, vinegar, coffee, soaps, salads, woodstains, oil dyes, and so on. It has been an astonishing achievement, so much so that Dr. David Fairfield, agricultural explorer in charge of the United States Department of Agriculture and world famous scientist, spoke of Doctor Carver as "one of the most remarkable and extraordinary minds I ever met."

Just before we prayed he had taken some of his peanut oil and rubbed it enthusiastically on the back of his aged, wrinkled hand and it became soft and pliable as a little child's. As I watched him I said to myself: "You are doing something more than making wrinkled, parched skin pliable and soft—you are bringing faith and courage and hope into the parched souls and minds of an inwardly discouraged people. The oil you are applying is the oil of your own spirit and intelligence." I myself went away renewed, refreshed, and youthened from the presence of this deathless old man.

I asked him how he got started on his amazing discoveries. And his reply was characteristic: "I took a peanut and I put it out in my hand and said, 'Mr. Creator, what's in that peanut?' And the Creator told me: 'You've got brains. You go and find out.'" And what a quest! And what astonishing worlds opened out of that tiny peanut! A Committee of the United States Senate asked him to speak for ten minutes before them. At the end of ten minutes they begged him to go on. For an hour and a half he held them spellbound as he showed them what was wrapped up by the Creator in that peanut. They would not let him stop.

I have sat at the table of that great Christian missionary and surgeon, Doctor Somerville, who got within two hundred feet of the top of Mount Everest, and I listened with awe as he described his pressing inch by inch toward the top. The same awe, and deeper, came upon me as I listened to this Negro scientist tell of

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

his explorations into the minute. Somerville did not get to the top and Carver did not get to the bottom, but they were both pilgrims of the Infinite.

As we stood in the middle of Doctor Carver's "den" and held each other's hands and prayed for each other, I felt I was on hallowed ground—hallowed by discoveries of God in the material and the spiritual. At the close of the prayer I raised his hand and kissed the back of it, and he did the same with mine. We knew we were blood brothers and belonged to a Kingdom which knew no frontiers of race or class or color. The social instinct had found its home in the ultimate Family, the Family of God, the Kingdom of God.

The lesser instincts too are fulfilled—the pugnacious instinct, for instance. The instinct to stand up and fight is not wiped out, nor is it warped to wrong ends. The Christian still fights, but now he fights against injustice and wrong, against the exploitation of the underprivileged, against war and its attendant evils—against evil in general and in particular. Paul could say, "I have fought in the good fight." Note that he had "fought"—he was not gelatinous, he was aggressive and bold. But it was "in the good fight"—the only good fight is the one where you fight not for yourself and your own interests, but for the interests of others. Cecil Rhodes said when a youth, "I determined that if there were any good wars, I would take part in them." This is the only "good war," with the only good weapons—the war against ignorance and poverty and sin and hate and fear; and the only good weapons are those that overcome darkness by light, evil with good, and hate by love and the world by a cross of suffering.

To sum up then: the human heart with its resentments, its fears, its selfishness, its guilts, and its consequent divided condition, needs release; needs something to give wholeness and inward unity and integration; needs something to give purpose and goal and meaning to life; needs something to take away estrange-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ments and bring fellowship with God and man. The new birth does just that. It is, therefore, realism.

A German radium expert was traveling throughout the world explaining and promoting the use of radium. He talked eloquently and persuasively of the wonders of radium and its beneficent rays. But the light had gone out of his own heart, so he told me, as we talked together on board ship. I gave him a copy of *For Sinners Only*, but he brought it back the next day with the comment: "This is too hectic for me. It doesn't get me." I took the book back and gave him Weatherhead's, *The Transforming Friendship*. The next day he came and reported, "This is quieter, this is getting me." When he finished reading the book, he said, "Now, I wish you would come to my cabin—I am prepared to make the adventure and surrender myself to God." We went and as we kneeled and prayed in the cabin he opened his heart as simply as a child and allowed the Light—the Light that was more eternal and more disease-destroying than radium, to come in. He arose from his knees a new man and clasping my hand he said: "All my life I've looked for just this. And to think it has come at last." His face was lighted by a Light never seen on land or sea.

"All my life I've looked for just this"—yes, that is the verdict of the human heart when it finds, for the human heart is made for this and when it finds it, it finds the soul's true Homeland.

"But how shall I find this new birth? Is there no ladder you can put up upon which I can climb out of my doubt and fear and divided condition into release and power?" In answer to that earnest query I think I can do no better than give you the ladder which Professor James calls "the ladder of faith." There are these steps upward, he says:

(1) There is nothing absurd about a certain view of the universe.

(2) It might be true under certain conditions.

THE REALISM OF THE NEW BIRTH

- (3) It is fit to be true.
- (4) It ought to be true.
- (5) It must be true.
- (6) It shall be true, at least as far as I am concerned.

Now take those steps: (1) Is there anything absurd about the Christian idea of there being a Mind behind the universe which apparently has intelligence written in it? Is it absurd to believe that that One behind and through the universe loves us and would redeem us, as the Christian gospel says? Certainly there is nothing absurd in such an idea, for if there is no intelligence back of the universe, how did I get it? Did the nonintelligent bring forth the intelligent? The purposeless bring forth purpose? If so, that would be a materialistic miracle.

(2) It might be true for me under certain conditions—I know I will have to meet those conditions. I cannot expect to know whether H_2O produces water unless I go into the laboratory and put those elements together, and try it. Nor can I expect to find God unless I am willing to obey God.

(3) It is fit to be true. The only objection I have against it is that it is too good to be true. But I now see it is too good not to be true.

(4) It ought to be true. There is a moral imperative within me which says that if this isn't true, then the universe is meaningless.

(5) It must be true. My inner needs and this offer of the possibility of those needs being met in Christ converge, and that converging simply says that it *must* be true.

(6) It shall be true, at least as far as I am concerned. I act to make it true. I wager my life on it. From this moment God has me. And I believe, I believe, I have God. If I feel unworthy to make such an affirmation, I turn my eyes from within to the Cross. I point to that and say, there stands my worthiness.

CHAPTER XI

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

A SOUTH AMERICAN YOUTH ONCE SAID TO ME, "I no longer believe in the good and the bad—I believe only in the beautiful and the ugly, and I am going to take the beautiful apart from the question of morality." This was the aesthetic approach to life. Other modern people say, "I no longer believe in the good and the bad—I believe only in the wise and the foolish. I am going to take the wise thing apart from the question of morality." This is the modern scientific approach to life.

Is it possible that the beautiful and the good and the wise coincide and are one? And is it possible that the ugly and the bad and the unwise coincide and are one? We have thought of the gospel as emphasizing the good and the bad, as teaching a system of morality—this is its central emphasis, we have said. But is the gospel of Christ a moral system and was Jesus a moralist? The gospel is not a moral code and Jesus was not a moralist. We miss the point if we take that approach.

Jesus was unfolding the nature of things—the nature of God, the nature of life and the nature of the laws underlying life. "A Christian is one who believes in God and man through Jesus Christ." He was interpreting, in His own Person and words, the nature of reality. If you live according to this nature of reality, you live; if you don't, you don't—that is what He was saying.

When He finished what people look on as the highest moral principles ever presented to man, namely, the Sermon on the

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

Mount, His comment on them was different from what we would have expected. We would have expected Him to say, "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken unto a good man which founded his house upon a rock." That would be what we would expect from a moralist who is summing up his system of morality. On the contrary, He uses the terms "wise man" and "foolish man." Is that the key to what He was doing and saying? I believe it to be, for in the Sermon on the Mount He was laying bare the nature of reality—the nature of God and consequently the nature of the reality underlying our personal and social relationships.

In the Sermon on the Mount He says in essence: "I am telling you how to live. If you listen to it and take it, then you are a wise man—the house of your life will be built upon the rock of reality, and when the storms of human existence beat upon your life, it will stand unshakable. But if you don't live according to this way, then you are a foolish man, for your house will be founded on the sands of unreality, and when the storms and pressures of life beat upon it, it will go down in a mighty crash of ruin. You may take it or leave it, but this is the way to live."

The use of these words "wise man" and "foolish man" gives us the clue to His whole outlook and teaching—and the clue to His life. The thing that impressed His contemporaries was His wisdom—His power to penetrate to the heart of things. Of Him as a child it is said, He "grew in wisdom;" and in the Temple as a boy "all that heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers." When He spoke in His home city, the people asked in astonishment, "What is the wisdom which is given unto this man?" They could not account for this penetrating wisdom. And in the midst of His unfolding the reality of things to His disciples He said, "Blessed are your eyes for they see." And when they were slow in getting at the reality, He said, "Do you not yet understand?" And the most devastating thing He could say of the religious leaders of His day was that they were "blind leaders

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of the blind;" they were trying to live in an impossible way and to get others to follow them in this impossibility. And concerning the rich man with his much goods laid up He simply said, "Thou fool." The virgins were classed as "wise" and "foolish." And His comment to the disciples on the road to Emmaus when they were slow to grasp reality was, "O foolish men."

All the way through He seemed to be astonished not at the evils of men, but at their stupidity. He found them trying to live against the nature of the universe, against the laws that bind men together, against their own natures, against God. His pronouncement was: "It cannot be done, and you are foolish to try it. You will simply break yourself in the process." He saw that God wasn't punishing men—they were punishing themselves; this punishment was inherent in the nature of things. As Dr. Richard Cabot says, "The great moral imperatives are laid down in the biological and psychological structure of human beings and in the structure of the world in which we live." In Romans 1. 27 (Moffatt) there is this penetrating comment, "Getting in their own persons the due recompense of their perversity." Evil is perverse—an attempt at the impossible, and the result is that those who try it get in their own persons the due recompense—their persons deteriorate, break down, perish in the process. Again this passage puts it even more vividly: "That nature which crumbles to ruin under the passions of moral deceit" (Ephesians 4. 22, 23, Moffatt). The apostle saw that when we are deceitful then we deceive no one except ourselves, for the result of the deceit is that our nature crumbles to ruin. The universe is not built for deceit, and those who try to play tricks on it simply play tricks on themselves—tragic tricks, for the house of Man Soul crumbles to ruin under it.

Again this impossible way of life is summed up in these words: "The fruitless enterprises of darkness" (Ephesians 5. 11, Moffatt). Evil blossoms and blooms and gives promise of fruit, but then decay sets in and we have rottenness on our hands. "It keeps the

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

word of promise to our ear and breaks it to our hope." Tennant puts it in these words: "The intrinsic nature of good and evil protects God's purposes from defeat. The good is self-conservative; the evil is essentially unstable." It is unstable because it is not founded on the reality of things. Davies put it this way: "Whilst sin is triumphant, yet it is always deprived of the results of its triumph. We see throughout history the providential utilizing of evil to the advancement of the good. Caesar built those magnificent Roman roads that he might swiftly and effectively subjugate subject peoples. It was over those very same roads that Paul and others traveled to proclaim the Good News to the Mediterranean world. . . . Sin wins the battle but loses the booty. At any moment sin is stronger, but in the total process it is always weaker, for it is self-destructive" (*On to Orthodoxy*, p. 116). Augustine was right when he said: "Sin and its punishment are one and the same thing."

Evil has the seeds of its own decay within itself. Isaiah cries out in these dramatic words: "This guilt of yours shall split you" (Isaiah 30. 13, Moffatt). It will cause inward division by being introduced into your inner nature, and that division will result in a civil war which will waste your powers and leave you exhausted and weak. And again the prophet cries: "Your fury shall consume yourselves" (Isaiah 33. 11, Moffatt). The fury and hate against others simply redounded against the hater. Hate consumes the hater more than the hated. Jesus puts it this way: "He that hateth his brother is a murderer"—not only of his brother, but of himself; he murders his peace, his powers, and his own person. To hate others is to hate oneself. The Spanish have gathered up this truth in this proverb: "He who spits against heaven, spits in his own face."

One of the most encouraging sayings Jesus ever uttered was this one: "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." He did not say that the seed of evil would not germinate and grow—it will, but in the end it

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

will be rooted up, for what God has not planted cannot prosper. If evil seems to be more like a giant oak than a plant, still the word is: "The ax is lying all ready at the root of the trees; any tree that is not producing good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire" (Luke 3. 9, Moffatt). John had just preached the Kingdom of God, and then he said the ax was lying all ready at the root of the trees—was this Kingdom of God the ax? Yes, the Kingdom has its own Nemesis within itself—obey it and you live; disobey it and you perish. Note that the ax is "all ready" there at the root of the tree—the forces of destruction are inherent and already present in the very facts of life.

The book of Revelation was written to give insight and courage to good people who were puzzled about the apparent triumph of evil over good, and the message of the whole book is summed up in these words: "*The rule of the world has passed to our Lord and His Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever . . . the time [has come] for destroying the destroyers of the earth*" (Revelation 11. 15, 18, Moffatt). "The time [has come] for destroying the destroyers of the earth"—the destroyers are themselves destroyed by the inherent nature of reality. While that destruction shall one day be open and dramatic and perhaps sudden, yet we must remember that this is not only a dramatic climax at the end but a continuing process running all through. Jesus laid down this principle: "Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together"—where there is rottenness there the forces of destruction are gathered together. The rottenness of our modern civilization has gathered to itself the eagles of destructive war. The rotting carcass of selfish greed and exploitation has resulted in the awful tragedy of war—its own Nemesis, the eagles gathering to the carcass.

To sum up in the words of J. R. Moseley: "Evil has no capital of its own—it has to do business on the capital of God. Evil holds on, not through any power of its own, but by imitating and utilizing the good. Plato saw that a band of robbers, if they were

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

wholly bad, would destroy each other before robbing any of us, but by utilizing the co-operative spirit and technique which they draw from the good they continue their business for a time."

This is one side of the picture—the futility, the stupidity, the impossibility of sin. Human nature is allergic to sin. We turn now to its opposite: the fruitfulness, the wisdom, the possibility of good. We are made for it, and where we find it we find ourselves. The man who aligns himself with the Kingdom of God written in his own make-up, lives and lives abundantly. The sum total of reality is behind him—he is living not against the grain of the universe, but with it. When he exerts his will, the will of God is exerted with it—omnipotence works with potency. "If I am sure I am co-operating with God and His purposes, then I am invincible." As Dean Matthew says: "As gravitation will help a man if he builds a wall plumb and oppose him if he builds it out of plumb, so human beings who order their lives in accordance with these personality-producing activities we conceive of as God, will build upon a rock. Not to live in harmony with them is to build on sand." (*Growth of the Idea of God*, p. 232).

Jesus said, "The earth bringeth forth fruit of itself"—the seed and the soil are made for one another, they fit. The seed is put in from without but the forces are there to respond. The human heart is made for the gospel—nature and nurture are one. To change the figure, someone has said, "All music is what awakes in you when you are reminded by the instruments." If there were no music already within you, you would never appreciate it when it came from the instruments. When the instruments commit musical sin—discord—then you inwardly revolt—it is a sin against the music within you. To change the figure again: Jesus uses a sentence that is one of the most oft-quoted of any in Scripture: "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again"—those who depend upon physical satisfactions alone have the doom of perpetual thirst upon them, "but whosoever drinketh of the waters that I shall give him shall never thirst." Why?

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

For the simple reason that thirst is the distress signal that the water-content of the body is below par, something vital is lacking. But when we have Christ at the depth of our being, then there are no distress signals, there is nothing lacking, for His presence becomes within us "a well of water springing up into everlasting life." As the ear is made for music, so the soul is made for this "water," and when it finds it, knows that there is nothing perishable about it—it springs up "into everlasting life." It has the feel of the eternal and the real upon it. Put these two phrases side by side: "shall thirst again" . . . "shall never thirst"—they each have three words in them, there is only a change of one word "again" into "never," and yet in that change of words there is a change of worlds—one is hell and the other is heaven.

There is a striking statement in Romans 8. 1 (Moffatt) which brings out this deathlessness of the life of the Kingdom: "There is no doom now for those who are in Christ Jesus." Everything outside of this new Kingdom has the doom of decay upon it—every pleasure, every endeavor, every accomplishment, every personality is doomed to disintegration. There is no survival value, no seed of permanence within them—they lack eternal life. We speak of "the crack of doom," but doom has already cracked for those who refuse this Kingdom—the silent falling apart of life, its disintegration and decay—that is "the crack of doom."

On the other hand, the apostle says that "all coheres in Him"—it holds together, it has the cement of eternal meaning and value in it, hence it "coheres," or holds together, under the strain and stress of human existence. "Pull yourself together," men often say to themselves and others, for they see how life falls apart, but a man in the Kingdom of God does not have to talk to himself this way, for he is inwardly relaxed and at peace with himself—he is not desperately trying to hold himself together. In Christ everything coheres, outside of Him everything col-

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

lapses. No wonder another writer speaks of Jesus as being the "heir of the universe" (Hebrews 1. 2, Moffatt). He is the heir of the universe because the universe won't run in any other way. At the end it must come out at His feet, for there is no other place to go!

Those who try to live in anti-Kingdom ways find the universe decaying under their touch. They touch love, and it turns to lust, and lust in turn becomes disgust. They touch rulership, and turn it into tyranny, and tyranny turns into revolt. They touch service, and turn it into servility and sycophancy, and that turns into slavery. They touch human relationships, and under their attitudes of hate and fear those relationships are snarled into conflict and war. If we speak of those whose touch turns everything to gold, we must speak of those whose touch turns the gold of life into base metal. They are not the heirs of the universe.

On the other hand, everything that Jesus touches He heightens. I found myself going through the New Testament and making almost every common noun into a proper noun. I had to begin almost every ordinary word with a capital letter. He touched the earth, a place of common matter without apparent goal or meaning, and lo, it becomes the Earth, the place where the Kingdom of God is to come and where the will of God is to be done as it is done in heaven.

He touched life, and life was no longer mere dull existence which had to be muddled through somehow; it was now Life—it had a sparkle in it, radiance, meaning, and destiny beyond one's fondest dreams or hopes.

He touched man, and man was no longer just a man destined for the dust at the end of a very dusty road. A man is no longer a thing—a slave, a chattel, a hand, a means to someone's else ends—he is a Man, a Man for whom Christ died. I glanced up from my writing and my eyes fell on this clipping from a daily paper regarding the attitude toward a man in an Indian state: The

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

only son of a poor man and his wife was devoured by a tiger, and failing to get any compensation from the state where the tigers were protected by stringent laws with a fine of Rs. 500 if one were killed (the killing was reserved for the Maharaja and his guests as sport), he and his wife attracted the attention of the public by carrying posters upon which was written, "Hai Beta, Hai Raj, Hai Ram" ("Alas for my son, Alas for the Government, Alas for God"). They were taken to the nearest police station "where they were consoled and at the same time threatened for their indulgence in such seditious activities." A fine of Rs. 500 for the killing of a tiger, a threat for calling attention to the killing of a son by a tiger—such is a man in the kingdom of man. But in the Kingdom of God a man has within his life a sense of regal dignity—he is now a Man.

Jesus touched the word "sorrow," which had been a dull, senseless, degrading, paralyzing thing, and turned it into Sorrow—something that now has redemptive purposes in it. A mere cross, with its writhing victim and its shame, has now become a Cross, a place where redemption is wrought out, turning tragedy into the redemptive purposes of God. Now, Sorrow takes us by the hand and leads us to God, while before it took us by the hand and led us to the clod.

Jesus touched the word "power," and it was no longer an instrument of tyranny and slavery, it was now Power, the instrument for the loosing of personality into fuller freedom.

He took hold of the word "god"—were there not three hundred and thirty million gods in the Hindu pantheon?—and made it into God, the one God of all men, our loving Heavenly Father.

He took hold of the word "word," which was something with dull, dead, earthly meanings in it. But after He touched it by the illustration of His own life and teachings it became the Word. Through that Word we began to see the meaning of all words, for that Word became the master-light of all our seeing. In it

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

are contained the meanings of God and Man and Life. It is the key Word that unlocks all words.

He heightened everything He touched. No wonder the apostle cried: "So shall all be made alive in Christ" (1 Corinthians 15. 22, Moffatt). This was spoken of the future, but here and now in Christ everything *lives*—dead hopes, dead souls, dead powers spring to life again when we are touched by Him. It is said that the dead body of the man which was thrown into the tomb of the prophet sprang into life again upon touching the dead bones of the prophet. Something more profound than that happens when dead lives and hopes of men come into contact with this living Christ. A beautiful Parsee lady told me that her father, who had died, had spoken from the spirit world to a Parsee friend and had said: "Here in heaven and on earth Jesus is greater than all others. He is greater even than our Zoroaster." We can believe that, not because some medium communicates this message from another world, but because here and now everything speaks the same message. Jesus said, "If these hold their peace the stones will cry out"—the hard, bare facts of life witness to the cry of the children, "Hosanna!"

When we are dealing with Christ and His Kingdom, we are dealing with "a city which hath foundations." The other cities are without foundations—they are crumbling to ruin under our very sight. This world-shaking convulsion will shake the cities that have no foundations, will shake them to the dust. But we have a city with foundations—foundations which are laid in the heart of reality. This Kingdom was "built from the foundations of the world," built into the realities of things, and therefore the apostle cried again, "We have a kingdom which cannot be shaken." Amid the shaking kingdoms of this world—the kingdoms founded on social and economic and political injustice—we have a Kingdom that stands as the only solid reality amid all this crumbling unreality.

And we can come out at this place now not by dogmatic asser-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

tion, and blind belief in Scripture, but by the method of experimentation, the method of trial and error, by the converging of the men of science and the men of religion upon the same basic facts. Some day science is going to lay it all down on the table in front of us and say, "This, and this, and this, is the way to live; and Not this, and Not this, and Not this." We will look at it in astonishment and say, "Why, brother men, what you say is the Kingdom-of-God way." And they will reply: "We don't know about the Kingdom-of-God way, but this is the way that life works. It will work this way and no other." That will be the reconciliation of science and religion—not a verbal reconciliation, but a vital reconciliation—life will bring us out at the same place. "What we call discovery in science may well be called Revelation," said a college principal in one of my Round Table Conferences, and she uttered a great truth, but she could have uttered the counter-truth, "What we call Revelation may well be called discovery in science." They come out at the same facts.

A bulletin recently put out by the Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene, "How Is *Your* Mental Health?" says: "You are in *poor* mental health *if* worry interferes with everything you do, if you run away from things that are hard for you, if you are always making excuses for yourself, if you think you are always right and cannot see the other person's point of view, if you lack faith in yourself, if you have fits of temper or go round with a chip on your shoulder, if you avoid people—live too much within yourself, if you have no aim in life, if you lack outside interests, if you neglect physical health. You are in good mental health if your worries are passing, if you tackle your responsibilities and do the best you can, if you admit your own mistakes and laugh at yourself, if you are tolerant with other people, if you have confidence in yourself and what you are doing, if you have control of your emotions, if you form real friendships with people, if you are trying to reach some goal in life, if you are constantly widening your interests, if you keep yourself physically fit."

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

Doctor Holman, commenting on the above, says: "It is astonishing how closely these insights coincide with those of religion, and particularly with the teachings of Christianity. Those attitudes characteristic of poor mental health are precisely those which religion seeks to overcome—fear, worry, hate, rage, avoidance of responsibility, self-centeredness, lack of love, lack of purpose in life. The attitudes characteristic of *good* mental health are precisely those that religion sponsors—love, hope, social interest, a lofty goal in life, a sense of belonging, a sureness of direction, a conviction of life's meaning and worth."¹ At the end of a course in pathology the professor of a medical college wrote on the blackboard: "Young men, remember one thing—sin=disease."

Science is laying it down on the table in front of us and it is increasingly speaking the truths of the Kingdom of God. Doctor Hyslop, of Bethlehem Mental Hospital, once said, "As one whose life has been concerned with the sufferings of the human mind, I believe that of all hygienic measures to counteract depression of spirits and all the miserable results of a distracted mind, I would undoubtedly give first place to the simple habit of prayer." Is this mental scientist not saying what we have been saying all along? If we think Doctor Hyslop's statement is an isolated one apart from the growing body of scientific conviction, then listen to Dr. William S. Sadler, Director of the Chicago Institute of Research and Diagnosis:

"I regard prayer as a master mind-cure, and personal religious experience as the highest and truest form of psychotherapy. There can be no question that the religion of Jesus, when properly understood and truly experienced, possesses power both to prevent and cure numerous mental maladies, moral difficulties, and personality disorders. It must be evident that fear and doubt are disease-producing, while faith and hope are health-giving; and in my opinion the highest possibilities of faith and

¹ *The Religion of a Healthy Mind*, pp. 199, 200. Round Table Press, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

the greatest power of hope are expressed in the sublime beliefs of religious experience. The teachings of Christ are the greatest known destroyers of doubt and despair.

"No one can appreciate so fully as a doctor the amazingly large percentage of human disease and suffering which is directly traceable to worry, fear, conflict, immorality, dissipation, and ignorance—to unwholesome thinking and unclean living. The sincere acceptance of the principles and teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living, would at once wipe out more than one half the difficulties, diseases, and sorrows of the human race. In other words, more than one half of the present affliction of mankind could be prevented by the tremendous prophylactic power of actually living up to the personal and practical spirit of the real teachings of Christ.

"The teachings of Jesus applied to our modern civilization—understandingly applied, not merely nominally accepted—would so purify, uplift, and vitalize us that the race would immediately stand out as a new order of beings, possessing superior mental power and increased moral force. Irrespective of the future rewards of religion, laying aside all discussion of future life, it would pay any man or woman to live the Christ-life just for the mental and moral rewards it affords here in this present world. Some day man may awake to the fact that the teachings of Christ are potent and powerful in preventing and curing disease. Some day our boasted scientific development, as regards mental and moral improvement, may indeed catch up with the teachings of this Man of Galilee."

When Dr. Alexis Carrel makes this statement purely as a scientist, "It appears that intelligence gives way when character weakens," is he not saying in measured scientific terms what the Christian faith has been saying in moral and emotional terms, "The wages of sin is death"—death to the mind, death to the body, death to the total personality? It's all on the table.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

Dr. Henry D. Link says, "Paradoxical as it seems, my return to religion was by the road of science, just as years before science had led me away from religion." And he gives the reason, namely, that in dealing with a great many maladjusted folk he was forced to realize "that the findings of psychology were largely a rediscovery of old religious truths." For instance, he says: "No discovery of modern psychology is, in my opinion, so important as its scientific proof of the necessity of self-sacrifice to self-realization. By nature the individual is selfish and inclined to follow his immediate impulses. The personality tests and the clinical experience of psychologists prove conclusively that this road leads to introversion, to emotional instability, to intellectual futility, to maladjustment, to unhappiness. It requires religion, something higher than the individual to overcome the selfish impulses of the natural man and lead him to a successful life."²

Dr. C. G. Jung, one of the greatest living psychotherapists, tells us that of all the thousands of cases he has treated during the past thirty years, of persons from all civilized lands, all of those who are past thirty-five years of age have had, as the basic cause of trouble, difficulties that could only be described as religious. And he further asserts that not one of all these cases has been cured except as a religious adjustment has been made. "Christianity produces the harmonious man," says the president of Fordham University. And he is right.

Jesus was constantly trying to get men to love, to get out of themselves, to have an understanding sensitiveness to the needs of others. And now, "Mental hygienists of all schools lay great stress upon the importance of social interest to mental health." As Dr. Adolph Meyer has pointed out: "The recessive, withdrawing, shut-in personality stands in imminent peril." And not only is the individual in peril, but his social relations with others are in peril. As Doctor Kunkel says: "It is invariably true that

² Henry D. Link, *Return to Religion*, p. 33. The Macmillan Company.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

these relationships become difficult to whatever degree the person is egocentric, that is, to whatever degree his tension-capacity is prevented from growing." The mental hygienists can now stand alongside the minister of religion and approve every word when he says: "Not only is this [egocentricity] an offense against social solidarity which brings its inevitable harvest of unpopularity and even active opposition, but in subtle ways it registers spiritual deterioration in the body also, as we may see from the faces of selfish people."⁸

Life will not work on the basis of selfishness. I found over the telegraph office windows in India this sign: "Please show the same courtesy here as you would like shown to you;" and I said to myself, "They can't even run a small set of relationships around a telegraph counter without applying the Golden Rule." Doctor Holman says: "When Jesus said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and thy neighbor as thyself,' He laid down a law which was not authoritative because He pronounced it, but which He stated because it was in its very nature authoritative. By spiritual insight He, and also those Old Testament writers who had uttered this same truth before Him, had penetrated to an understanding of the spiritual law which governs human relationships. And all history testifies to its truth. One may no more violate the law of love than one may dare violate the law of gravity. Jump from an eighteenth-story window and you will be dashed to death. Violate the law of love and you disrupt comradeship, break up the home, disorganize society. How could you expect that terrible violation of the law of love, the World War, with its frightful expression of hate, selfishness, and cruelty, to have other results than those which actually followed—the tragic aftermath of suffering and disaster. Hate disintegrates both social and personal life; love unifies, builds up,

⁸ H. Wheeler Robinson, *Suffering, Human and Divine*, p. 68. The Macmillan Company.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

enriches. It is God's settled habit of behavior; it is His character."⁴

How can we expect anything but poverty and strife and war from an economic and social system which violates the law of love in its fundamental postulate and outlook by making selfish private profit its driving motive and power? You cannot expect figs of thistles, nor can you expect brotherhood from the violation of the law of love, or brotherliness. Doctor Thomas, an outstanding economist of the Madras University, in a personal letter says: "I am able to say definitely that the right course morally is also the wisest course economically. The one thing that the last depression taught us is that it was denying purchasing power to the weaker nations and weaker classes in all nations that has caused the trouble. The greed of nations and the selfishness of capitalists have hit them at least as much as the others. World economy today would function without a hitch if the Kingdom of God were realized. To keep your neighbor poor while you rise in wealth is now unsound economic policy; for without a corresponding rise in your brother's purchasing power, you will yourself be hit, whatever may be your business. India is the biggest demonstration of this truth." The laws of the Kingdom of God are written in what we call economic law, in fact economic law, as far as it is real law, and not mere hazarded opinion, is a discovery of the laws of the Kingdom as they underlie economic relationship. The Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon in the Mart both say, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Aristotle discovered this truth ages ago when he said: "To be perfectly selfish you must be unselfish." In other words, if you want to develop yourself, then develop others; if you want to hurt yourself, then hurt others. You needn't love your neighbor as you love yourself, but if you don't, then you can't get along

⁴ *The Religion of a Healthy Mind*, p. 163. Round Table Press, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

with him; and, moreover, you can't get along with yourself—you yourself deteriorate and are consequently unhappy.

Ruskin sums up this whole matter in these words: "Government and co-operation are, and in all things, eternally the law of life; anarchy and competition are, and in all things, and eternally the law of death." No more penetrating words could sum up the meaning of the Kingdom of God: It is a Government which results in co-operation, which results in life.

This law of co-operative love is written deeply, not only in our relationships with each other but in our own personal selves. Personal life is built on the basis of mutual aid and co-operation. The body is a co-operative unit and exists as such. Life begins as co-operation when the ovum and the sperm come together to form a new life. And a remarkable fact happens when, just before uniting to form a new cell, each reduces its number of chromosomes to half, that is, to twenty-four, so that when they fuse the resulting single cell begins its great adventure with its proper number of forty-eight. In other words, each surrenders something of itself to find itself in a larger and fuller life. So if the law of co-operation is written within the structure of our beings, so is also the law of self-surrender to a larger whole. There is no co-operation without self-limitation. We must give up, to get. And when those cells grow into a body, the law of self-limitation and co-operation runs through the whole.

Should the body begin to be competitive within itself, it would perish. If the hands would fall out and refuse to co-operate with each other, our work could not go on; if the feet should become individualistic and selfish and nonco-operative with each other, one wanting to walk in one direction while the other wanted to go the opposite, then both would be stultified and progress would be at a standstill, and worse; if the eyes should quarrel and begin to nonco-operate with each other, one reporting one image while the other reported the opposite, there would be no seeing at all—there would be confusion and blindness; if the ears should

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

compete with each other and repeat opposing sounds, the result would not be hearing but a hopeless jumble of sounds—a veritable torture. In every action there are two sets of muscles—one relaxes as the other grows tense; without this co-operation there could not be a single action. There are also two sets of nerves concerned in every action, and without their co-operation there is paralysis. Co-operation is at the basis of our bodily life.

But not only is co-operation written within us in these more obvious ways mentioned, but in more subtle and redemptive ways. Dr. W. B. Cannon says: "A noteworthy prime assurance against extensive shifts in the status of the fluid matrix is the provision of sensitive automatic indicators or sentinels, the function of which is to set corrective processes in motion at the very beginning of a disturbance. If water is needed, the mechanism of thirst warns us before any changes in the blood have occurred, and we respond by drinking. If the blood pressure falls and the necessary oxygen supply is jeopardized, delicate nerve endings in the carotid sinus send messages to the vasomotor center and the pressure is raised. If by vigorous muscular movements blood is returned to the heart in great volume, so that cardiac action might be embarrassed and the circulation checked, again delicate nerve endings are affected and a call goes to the auricle, that results in speeding up the heart rate and thereby hastening the blood flow. . . . The system commonly works as a unit. It is remarkable indeed that such unified action can be useful in circumstances so diverse as low blood sugar, low blood pressure and low temperature."⁵

If co-operation is built into the very structure of our physical make-up and is the law underlying our very beings, how dare we try to build up the body of humanity on the principle of competition within itself and expect it to survive and prosper? It is not merely wrong—it is profoundly stupid and self-destructive.

⁵ *The Wisdom of the Body*, pp. 270, 280. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ative. Cancer cells in the body are cells which have turned selfish. They refuse to serve and demand to be served—they compete with the rest of the cells instead of contributing to the rest—hence they are cancerous. The body of humanity has turned cancerous and is sick nigh unto death for this very reason. We have pushed out the Kingdom-of-God principle of loving your neighbor as you love yourself and introduced the principle of loving yourself alone—and now we are cancerous, and these dreadful pains that shoot through the body of humanity—the pains of war, are cancer pains.

Moreover, this principle of co-operation within the body demands an exact balance between the self-interest and the other-interest. In the coming together of the sperm and the ovum each surrenders exactly the same number of chromosomes, twenty-four, and retains exactly the same number, in other words each loves its neighbor as it loves itself, no more, no less. As Dr. William Osborne Greenwood, the biologist, says: "Even a small deviation would result in the mechanism being thrown out of gear, so delicately exact is the process. . . . It is a question of accurate equipartition of chromosomal substance, and obviously it must be so if any species of animal or plant is to preserve its identity; otherwise a few generations would throw every species into the most hopeless and chaotic confusion, and there could be no such thing as evolution. If there is an unbalance, if there is the slightest deviation, then that irregular cell division becomes a malignant tumor and that malignant tumor means one thing—self destruction."⁶ And this matter of irregular cell division works both ways: if one gives more and the other gives less, then there is not merely the destruction of the one giving less, there is also the destruction of the one giving too much. Does that principle work out in life? Yes, for we have all seen, where, in a home, one brother or sister completely subordinates himself

⁶*Biology and Christian Belief.* The Macmillan Company.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

or herself and slaves to send some of the others to school and as a result loses the chance for education, then there is a crippling of that life no matter how noble the sacrifice intended. In that case they refused to love themselves, an unbalance took place, and deterioration set in—in both the recipient and the giver.

This principle of the equal worth of every human personality is written in the very constitution of our being. It is the foundation upon which Democracy rests. And this foundation is not merely built into a political theory apart from life, it is built into the very foundations of our bodily and spiritual existence. Professor Benes, once the president of Czecho-Slovakia, a nation now under the heel of autocracy, proclaimed his faith in these words: "Democracy will not perish because of the nature of human life and of the human soul." He was right—profoundly right.

Autocracies will have their brief day, perhaps a bloody brief day, but the day is brief because autocracy breaks itself upon the facts underlying life. A half truth always breaks down under the stress of life. It has no proper foundations in human nature, therefore it sooner or later crumbles. Democracy will survive the present orgy of force, for the human soul will come to itself as out of a drunken fit and will reassert itself, and democratic forms of life, finer and more thoroughgoing than the ones we now have, will emerge. But in doing so it must grasp the truth that keeps alive autocracy, precarious though that existence may be. There is a truth in the leadership principle. If we are made for Democracy, made for a society in which there is the equal worth of every human person, nevertheless we are also made for obedience to authority. It is written within us that certain portions of our body occupy a privileged position because of the service to the whole. "In starvation, for instance, some tissues waste away, i. e., yield some of their structure, but not the tissues of the heart and brain. . . . It may be that the heart and brain are well provided with water even to the end of a disastrous term

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of thirsting, at the expense of other organs.”⁷ This shows the principle of privileged position because of special service to the whole—the heart and the brain serve most and are most vital to the whole, and therefore are served most. But the commanding must be according to the principles laid down in the constitution of our beings, or else there is disaster to the body and to the brain. If the brain is a monarch, it is a constitutional monarch, and must govern according to fixed principles, or perish. It is free to work along lines laid down in the very structure of the whole. When it does that, it is free to command and the rest of the body is free to obey. So, written in ourselves is both the democratic principle and the leader principle. The Kingdom of God fulfills both, for it affirms the sacredness and the equal worth of every human personality and thereby lays the foundations for Democracy, but it also affirms that God is God and that He rules—rules, it is true, because He is the servant of all, but He rules. And when one comes under that Rule he knows that he is finding the thing for which he is made, he finds his own freedom. As Macmurray says: “Freedom, in its full sense, can only be achieved when our intention is in harmony with the nature of reality of which we are a part, that is to say, when our will and God’s will coincide.”⁸ Democracy is the thesis of which Dictatorship is the antithesis, and the Kingdom of God, gathering up the truths in both and eliminating their evils, becomes the Synthesis. This Synthesis, gathering up the total meaning of life within itself, becomes the Cause to which we can give ourselves with total abandon.

This need of a Cause is deeply written in the necessities of our human nature. We are inwardly made to give ourselves to something outside ourselves, and in the giving of ourselves to find ourselves. Dr. Will Durant, in “Letters to a Would-be

⁷ W. B. Cannon, *The Wisdom of the Body*, p. 87. W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.

⁸ John Macmurray, *Clue to History*, p. 71. Harper & Brothers.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

Suicide," says: "If we think of ourselves as part of a living (no merely theoretical) group, we shall find life a little fuller, perhaps even more significant. For to give life meaning one must have a purpose larger than one's life. . . . If a thing has significance only through its relation as part to a larger whole, then though we cannot give a metaphysical and universal meaning to all life in general, we can say of any life in particular that its meaning lies in its relation to something larger than itself."⁹ That would-be suicide to whom Doctor Durant was writing could not be saved from himself and his own troubles until he found some Cause outside of himself in which he might lose himself. But one has the feeling that Doctor Durant himself was looking for just some such Cause and had not found it. In one of his books he ends up his discussion about the quest for life's meaning by saying to this effect: "Good-by, reader, I am going off to play with my children." The implication being that the meaning of life is to be found in one's intimate human relationships. But my inward comment was, as I laid the book down: "But suppose something happens to his children? What then?" He would be left without a Cause that would survive that shock. He had built his nest too low and the flood of death would sweep it away. His Cause was a cause—and as such wouldn't meet his inmost need. Goethe says, "Be a Whole, or join a Whole." But man in himself cannot be a Whole. The Vedantist tries this by making himself Brahma, God, but the result is that this proclaiming oneself as God reacts into skepticism about God—all-God often becomes no-God. Man knows he is not a Whole—he is limited, a mere segment of the arc of reality. He knows too that no talking about making Humanity the Whole will do. For Humanity as a whole is not a Whole. Neither the individual in himself, nor Humanity in itself constitute a Whole. Comte's worship of Humanity has not been taken seriously

⁹ *On the Meaning of Life*, p. 127. Julian Messner, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

anywhere except in South America, where cults have tried to fill the emptiness of the house of Man Soul with a conglomeration of men, called Humanity. The result is that you add emptiness to emptiness, and that doesn't add up to fullness. No, man needs something more eternal than Man to worship and adore.

I was in an aeroplane going across the Rockies and opposite me sat a New York lawyer who was going to the West Coast to bury his sister—a sad errand. He was bolstering himself up against the tragedy by soaking himself with liquor. In the supreme crisis he had no resources on the inside so he had to try to take in some from a bottle. It was all a failure of nerve, crutches for a lame duck. It was a pathetic performance for a man. In rather a muddled way, he turned to me and said as we went over hundreds of miles of mountains: "The worst of this is that we haven't got a landing place." I inwardly replied, "I've got one!" I had a landing place whatever happened to that plane! God, the Kingdom of God, Eternal Life—these were my landing places scattered along the way. I had attached myself to a Cause which, while it was to function on earth, was to function beyond earth. It was a Whole, was The Whole, so that nothing could happen, like the tiny incident of an aeroplane falling, to upset this eternal Fact to which I was eternally attached. When one is in contact with the Kingdom of God, he feels that this is It—that Something for which we have looked all our lives. It is the Cause of Causes.

Man needs just such a Cause, a Cause that shall gather up the lesser meanings of life and give meaning to the whole, a Cause to which we can give ourselves without fear or doubt of its being ultimate and of final worth; a Cause which, while it comprehends the whole of life, sends me to work it out in the minute details of ordinary living; a Cause which becomes very personal to me in Christ, for He and the Cause are one; a Cause which provides for a new social and economic order to put under this rotten, toppling order, and at the very same time provides for the per-

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

sonal redemption of my own inner life from conflicts and fears and sins. This is the Cause that makes all other Causes pale before it into insignificance.

But it is just this devotion to a Cause which I find youth in East and West to lack. The youth of America I found to be the finest generation of youth we have ever had: they were two inches taller on the average than the previous generation, they were better educated, more frank and honest, with greater instruments of power in their hands, they had everything except one thing—A Cause. They were all dressed up and ready, but standing dead in their boots, because they had nothing to which to give themselves. They had no Cause. And without that, life was going to pieces on their hands.

And often the worst thing about it is that they don't know they don't have a Cause. When I stated to a group of students in America that they had everything except a Cause, one of them objected and said they did have a Cause, and when I asked what it was he replied, "We want to succeed." Personal success in terms of money accumulation was the Cause! And lest the older generation hold up its hands in horror let me say that when I repeated this story to one of the leaders in molding public opinion in America, he replied, "That was a very good answer." He too thought that personal success was a Cause!

When I asked some college principals in India what their students were interested in one replied: "Cinemas," and another replied, "Personal success." No wonder they are inwardly chaotic, for nothing controls them, commands them, nothing has their loyalty supremely, so they become the ineffective creatures of the passing moment, the passing desire and the passing craze.

When I went to Australia I found a nation without a Cause. Nothing gathered up its great energies into living coherence, hence there is an overemphasis on sport and a dissipation of energy and time and substance in drink and gambling, a nation great in possibilities, but with nothing great as its goal. When I

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

presented the Kingdom of God as the Cause they needed, to give a great goal and thus make a great people, a professor of the university said: "Say that all over Australia. It is our national need. We are a people without a Cause." I did. And out of it has been formed "The Christian Commonwealth Movement," a movement to make Australia a demonstration in its corporate life of the meaning of the Kingdom of God. To the degree that this nation takes this, and embodies it, it will grow great with the greatness of its purposes.

Germany has grown great in power, not because it had a great purpose, but because it had *a* purpose. That purpose gathered up its energies into a single channel and has thereby made the nation effective—effective in force. But this has its limitations. It will go so far and no further, for that force, effective up to a certain point, becomes ineffective when moral qualities are required, for it is a moral universe, and only those who fit into that moral universe ultimately survive. In the city of Canton, a city being bombed four or five times a day, I said to an audience: "Is life a bubble, a bomb, or an egg? they are all three shaped alike. Is life emptiness (a bubble), force (a bomb), or infinite possibilities (an egg)?" When I asked the question of whether life was a bomb, a German in the audience was so excited he could not contain himself, so he blurted out: "No, not like a bomb, for a bomb has no germ of life. It can only explode and destroy, it cannot put together, for it lacks the germ of life in itself." He was right, force can destroy, but cannot put together, only a constructive force like love or good will can do that. Force has its limitations. "A country," says Lord Samuel, "which ruthlessly pursues only its own aggrandizement invites a general hostility; 'he who makes many afraid of him has himself many to fear;' the statesman who wins friends for his country is the best patriot."¹⁰ Force has, indeed, its limitations, but it is

¹⁰ Lord Samuel, *Belief and Action*, p. 210. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

power up to a certain point, for it represents purpose, but it breaks down for it lacks ultimate qualities.

We need a purpose, a Cause. "To accomplish anything," says M. MacNeile Nixon, "you need an interest, a motive, a center of your thought. You need a star to steer by, a cause, a creed, an idea, a passionate attachment. . . . Something must beckon you, or nothing is done, something about which you ask no questions." But we need a Cause that coincides with the nature of reality, a Cause about which we ask no question because it is beyond question. Obviously, the only thing that would fit that demand is the Kingdom of God. This demand for such a cause as the Kingdom of God is deeply written in the necessities of our whole make-up. It is not something imposed. The Kingdom of God is within us, and the necessity of the Kingdom of God is within us.

When we try to put life together without giving it a Cause, we fail. Dr. Alexis Carrel says: "Psychoanalysis in directing the mind of the patient upon himself may aggravate the unbalance; instead of indulging in self-analysis, it is better to escape from oneself through an effort that does not scatter the mind." But to escape from oneself is impossible unless we find a Cause in which we can lose ourselves. That Cause is obviously the Kingdom, and the Person who embodies that Cause is obviously Christ. Both are necessary, for if the need of a Supreme Cause is deeply written within us, there is just as definite a need of that Cause being embodied in a Person, for we are persons and cannot be ultimately attached to an impersonal Cause. The Germans see this and are training their youth to say this watchword: "Whoever serves Adolf Hitler serves Germany, and whoever serves Germany serves God." We doubt the sequence there, but we see what they are feeling for—some attachment to a person, which would mean attachment to a Cause, which would mean attachment to God. Only the Kingdom of God and Christ fulfill that, for whoever

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

serves Christ serves the Kingdom of God, and whoever serves the Kingdom of God serves God.

This is the Cause concerning which, when we receive it within our hearts as a little child, we ask no further question. This is It. It fits the soul as love fits the heart—they are made for each other. That brings us to the last necessity we see written in ourselves—the need for certainty, the need for something, which, when it comes, ends all debate and hesitation and fear. For we live in a deeply shaken world, and its certainties are gone. I was on a train in Central India and the swollen flood waters were rushing beneath the bridge on which we found ourselves. Houses with animals upon their roofs floated beneath us. The bridge was trembling like an aspen leaf. The engineer hesitated to go forward, for the other side of the bank had been cut into by raging waters, and the track at the junction of the bridge and the bank was being undermined. Nor could he very well go back. Being convinced that the bridge might collapse at any moment I took off my shoes and my coat and planned how I would try to leap clear of the wreckage into the river if the bridge collapsed. The chances of doing it were slim, but the attempt would have to be made. After anxious moments we finally crept through inch by inch to safety, but we were the last train across.

We are all on this trembling bridge of civilization today, for the floods of world war are shaking it to its foundations. Whether we can creep across this catastrophe to safety and an open future is the question haunting many minds. And plans for personal escape are the immediate concern of many. We need confidence and assurance—a confidence and assurance based, not on the supposition that there is no flood and the bridge is not trembling, but based on the confidence that we have an alternative, an alternative which is based upon the solid realities of the universe, based on God and His Kingdom.

And men need assurance not only that they have plans in the large, but something that assures them as individuals that God

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

cares and that He is near, that nothing need make them afraid, that He forgives and restores and that with His presence and power they are adequate for anything. They want to know that prayer has reality and that Somebody hears and sympathizes and answers. On our Prayer Knoll at our Ashram in Sat Tal we sit in meditation and prayer in the early morning hours and above our heads in the trees often sits the Brain-Fever bird, which cries out in seeming mockery, "*Brain-fever*, BRAIN-FEVER," in a maddening crescendo, the implication being that those of us who sit there in prayer and meditation are afflicted with brain-fever, and nothing beyond the stirrings of our own fevered brains and imaginations takes place. Is that so? Or, does something really happen there? Do we go to it weak and rise full of power? Do we come to it confused and arise full of certainty and direction? Do we come to it empty and arise with a sense of fullness and repletion? Do we come to it with the sense of God—afar off, and come away with Him intimate and near and tender? Do we come to it orphaned and estranged and come away feeling at home with ourselves, our brother, our universe, and with God? A long and glorious experience of testing tells me that it is so. Every fiber of our moral and spiritual and mental and physical nature witnesses to renewal, to the God-touch, to adequacy and power.

I remember going to that Prayer Knoll perplexed and beaten. The doctors had pronounced our daughter so ill that it was necessary that we leave India at once and seek treatment in the West. This verdict meant the breaking up of the Ashram for the summer, and a crowd had gathered from all over India at a good deal of expense, and we were just starting. In the midst of the Prayer Hour the Inner Voice came clear and distinct: "It is all right. She is well." Such an overwhelming sense of assurance came over me that I was bursting with joy and assurance. But the doctor's verdict remained. I cared not—this assurance was final. I knew it. The doctor examined her again, sent word that she was entirely healed and we need not go. The Voice has never let

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

me down, not once. Now I know that the Brain-Fever bird, and all other mocking critics of prayer, are talking about their own brain-fever, not ours. For we are dealing with solid reality.

It is this need of certainty that is written deep within our constitutions. Without it life becomes uncertain and confused and often breaks down. Dr. H. S. Liddell, at Cornell University, has been experimenting with animals regarding some of the causes for nervous breakdown. "In these experiments the stimuli which turn a sheep or pig neurotic have nothing to do with pain or fear. In a typical case the animal is first conditioned to expect a small shock after it hears the tick of the metronome. When this conditional reflex is well established, conflicting stimuli are applied. The animal may receive a shock when the metronome beats a hundred and twenty times a minute, and no shock at a hundred beats a minute. Gradually the animal is forced into confusion, just as a man becomes flustered when faced by a complex situation. Repeated frequently enough, this confusion results in a real neurosis, as a result of which the animal reacts indiscriminately (whether shocked or not) to any kind of stimulus." There is a nervous breakdown. And the nervous breakdown came from conflicting stimuli causing confusion.

It is much the same with human beings. We live in a world where we are subjected to stimuli of a contradictory nature—some of it tells us there is a God, and some of it says that God is indifferent; some of it says that there is Divine Providence, and some of it says that Chance rules; some of it seems to say that the Kingdom of God is the one solid reality, and some of it says that it is idealized unreality; some of it says that goodness and truth and love are the final arbiters of human affairs, and some of it says that force has the final word. The radio, the press, the school-room and sometimes the pulpit are giving such contradictory stimuli to men that they are landed into utter confusion. Humanity gets the "jitters," a nervous breakdown ensues.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

The remedy is to find certainty and stability in the inner life. It is this fight for inner stability that is vital. It is so physically. The great French physiologist, Claude Bernard, says: "It is the fixity of the 'milieu interieur' which is the condition of free and independent life, . . . and all the vital mechanisms, however varied they may be, have only one object, that of preserving constant the conditions of life in the internal environment." This endeavor of the whole body after internal stability enables the body to remain inwardly constant, amid a changing environment, to an amazing extent. Doctor Cannon says: "Men may be exposed to dry heat at temperatures 239 to 257 degrees (Fahrenheit) without an increase in their body temperature above normal. On the other hand, arctic mammals, when exposed to cold as low as 31 degrees below zero (Fahrenheit) do not manifest any noteworthy fall of bodily temperature." . . . "The organism suggests that stability is of prime importance. It is more important than economy. The organism throws away not only water and salts, but sugar, if they are present in excess in the fluid matrix. This rejection is uneconomical. The organism is driven into convulsions if the sugar supply runs low, and the convulsions mark the acme of manoeuvres which bring forth extra sugar from hepatic reserves to restore the normal glycemic percentage. Violent shivering may be induced to develop the additional heat which prevents a fall of bodily temperature."¹¹ May it not be that the inner life of humanity has been thrown off the balance of stability and that the convulsions through which we are going are an attempt on the part of the body of humanity to restore the needed elements to allow the body of humanity to live on? And may it not be that since the inner temperature of the body of humanity has gone low as the inner certainties have faded out, that this violent world shivering is an attempt to bring back the body of humanity to a normal temperature? We have the "jitters"—why? Do these

¹¹ *The Wisdom of the Body*, pp. 22, 299. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

"jitters" not lay bare the secret of our need, and are they not purposive? Do they not point us to the necessity of an inner Kingdom that cannot be shaken?

I see no basis for inner stability, either for the individual or for humanity as a whole, outside of a Kingdom which is eternal, but which functions in time; which gives one the sense that while he is using material things he is not dependent on them ultimately; which gives him a fixed point of reference amid changing fashions and demands; which allows a man to live and move but not have his being amid the passing kingdoms of this world; which makes a man immovably fixed in God, and therefore unafraid of anything. Stability is achieved. We need not go up and down with our environment, we have our own. Like the diver who goes down to the bottom of the sea and can live there for some time because he has brought his own environment of oxygen down with him and is constantly fed through the pipe line from above, so we can live in these kingdoms, because we are not of these kingdoms; we can breathe a purer air and not be asphyxiated by the poisonous air about us; we can live as one in Time and yet be Timeless; we can be subject to all men and yet subject to none. We can be deprived of all and yet possess all, we can know how to be abased and know how to abound. We are not subject to the up-and-down of life. We have achieved stability. On board some ships there is what is called a stabilizer which keeps the ship from going up and down with every passing wave. The real Christian has found that stabilizer. He is the most dependent man and the most independent—the most dependent on God and the most independent of man.

While he belongs to the Timeless he has learned to live today and not worry about tomorrow. The eternal significance of life gives significance to today. So he learns to live one day at a time, not telescoping tomorrow's troubles and sorrows into today: "Sufficient unto the day is the day's trouble." He tells his soul:

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

"Build a little fence of trust around today,
Fill in the space with loving words and therein stay,
Look not through the sheltering bars upon tomorrow,
God will help thee bear what comes of joy or sorrow."

This is psychologically as well as spiritually sound. For, as we have seen, anxiety and worry are at the basis of many derangements in the proper functioning of the body. When Jesus strikes at the basis of this worry, He is helping us to live wholesome living. He said that two things cause worry: 1. Trying to live tomorrow before it comes. 2. Trying to live without trust in God. Live today, trust God, that is His prescription. And it is sound. Someone has suggested that we should have a Bureau of Negative Statistics—a Bureau which will compile the troubles we thought were coming, but which really never come. It would probably have a greater compilation of statistics than a Bureau of Positive Statistics which would deal with the actual troubles that have happened. By not telescoping tomorrow's troubles into today we would probably cut our troubles in half. And that remaining half can be met and conquered.

They can be conquered not by merely muddling through them with grim determination to bear them at all costs, but by intelligently taking them up into the purposes of our lives and making them contribute to the purposes for which we live. "Give me," says Epictetus, "what you please and I will turn it into good. Bring me illness, poverty, suffering, condemnation to death—all this shall be turned into profit." This was a beautiful but almost chance saying of a philosopher which was never built into a real way of life. But in the Christian gospel it is not a chance attitude—it is the very essence of its teaching, it is the very heart of its way of life, it is one of the meanings of the cross. This method teaches us to lay hold on the raw material of human living—pleasure and pain, compliment and criticism, triumph and tragedy, to take it up into our life purposes, to weave it into the

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

tapestry of our life plan, and to make it give varied coloring to the whole. God does this. I said that this method is one of the meanings of the Cross. I should have said that it is *the* meaning of the Cross. In Romans 3. 5, Moffatt, we read: "If our iniquity thus serves to bring out the justice of God." "Our iniquity thus serves!" Think of the possibility of making iniquity serve our own ends. God does make iniquity serve. The Cross was iniquity, He turned it into the healing of iniquity. Was there ever anything so iniquitous as the hate that put Jesus on the Cross? And yet through that very hate He manifested the love of God. Did life ever speak a crueler or more iniquitous word than at the Cross? And yet Jesus took that cruelty and iniquity and turned it into atonement. That is victory. And that is the victorious way of life He passes on to us as our way of life.

Paul speaks of: "It was because of an illness (you know) that I preached the gospel to you on a former visit" (Galatians 4. 13, Moffatt). Think of taking an illness and making it contribute to the founding of a Christian church! And out of the founding of that Christian Church we have a letter, the Epistle to the Galatians, which has fed, directed, and inspired the universal Church through all ages. And he took hold of an illness—being laid aside from his journeys—and made it contribute to that marvelous end. Instead of whining over his illness and complaining that God wasn't good, he took hold of that illness and made it contribute to the health of the world. The same thing happened in the founding of the Philippian church. That church was born out of the injustice inflicted on Paul and Silas when they were beaten until their backs bled and then thrust into an inner prison with hands and feet in stocks. The story of how the jailer was converted and the foundations of a Christian church were laid before morning is an old story, but it has a deathless message. Think of laying hold of that injustice and turning it into a Christian church! And then think of what a Letter was written to that church and what that Letter has meant to the world in the

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

way of inspiration and guidance. Here is an unbeatable way of life. It feeds on calamity, distilling the nectar of victory from the poison in every happening.

The Christian that knows this secret is safe, for he can use anything that can happen to him. He knows the truth of the saying, "Sorrow is a pick that mines the heart," and out of that mining rich ore comes to the surface—ore, oftentimes, the existence of which was not even suspected. The Icelandic proverb which says, "What a happy world it is, and how happy it is for the sorrow that is in it," has this truth in it, for it sees the possibility of making the sorrow into song. The little schoolgirl, in her essay on "True Greatness," said: "A person can never get True Greatness by trying for it. It is nice to have good clothes, it makes it a lot easier to act decent, but it is a sign of true greatness to act when you have not got them just as good as if you had. One time when Ma was a little girl they had a bird at their house called Bill, that broke his leg. They thought they would have to kill him, but next morning they found him propped up sort of sideways on his good leg, singing. That was true greatness. . . . Once there was a woman that lived near a pigpen, and when the wind blew that way it was very smelly, and at first when she went there she could not smell anything but pig, but when she lived there awhile she learnt to smell the clover through it. That was true greatness." It was. And it is fundamentally the Christian way. Wordsworth, in the character of the "Happy Warrior," catches the truth:

"Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed—miserable train!—
Turns his necessity to glorious gain;
In face of these doth exercise a power
Which is our human nature's highest dower;
Controls them and subdues, transmutes, bereaves
Of their bad influence, and their good receives."

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

As H. Wheeler Robinson says: "The answer is not from the outside, from Nature inward, but, rather, from the inward discovery of Grace operating within us and beyond us, from the reality of resources actually at hand that enable a person to absorb pain and suffering without spoiling one's joys. . . . The peace we are seeking is not the peace of escape from the sufferings of life, but the peace of victory won in their very midst and through their endurance." . . . "This truth is illustrated by chlorophyll, which is the substance that gives to plants and trees their green color, and whose function it is to transform the elements derived from earth and air into plant food, when the plant is exposed to sunlight. Since all animal life ultimately depends on the food supplied by plants, we can understand the claim made by a distinguished biologist that chlorophyll is 'the most wonderful substance in the world.' Just as the secret of all our physical life depends on this transforming power, which lifts chemistry to the higher level of biology, so we may say that the secret of all spiritual life lies in its power to transform every external happening into something beyond itself and so bring human life into its closest relation to God."¹² The Christian has learned the secret of chlorophyll—he transforms everything good, bad and indifferent into food. He will therefore do as the French poet Aubrey de Vere suggests:

"Count each affliction, whether light or grave,
God's messenger sent down to thee: do thou
With courtesy receive him; rise and bow;
And, ere his shadow pass thy threshold, crave
Permission first his heavenly feet to lave;
Then lay before him all thou hast, allow
No cloud of passion to usurp thy brow,
Or mar thy hospitality; no wave

¹² *Suffering, Human and Divine*, pp. 7, 134, 135. The Macmillan Company.

THE WISDOM OF THE KINGDOM

Of mortal tumult to obliterate
The soul's marmoreal calmness: Grief should be,
Like joy, majestic, equable, sedate;
Confirming, cleansing, raising, making free;
Strong to consume small troubles; to command
Great thoughts, grave thoughts, thoughts lasting to the end."

Of all the necessities written in the constitution of man this necessity for a capacity and power to transmute the base metal of daily sorrow and pain and frustration into the gold of character, is perhaps the deepest necessity. The Christian is not afraid of life, for healed at the heart he can now say, "Let Sorrow come on; I can use it." He is prepared to live, for he can make everything contribute to living.

To sum up this chapter: The Christian way is not merely the way of goodness, it is the way of wisdom. Everyone who lives according to it is a wise man, and everyone who tries to live against it is a fool. He is attempting the impossible.

In the words of Browning: "Somehow the best men are the wisest too; something instinctive guides their steps aright."

CHAPTER XII

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

THE THOUGHTFUL READER MAY BE TEMPTED TO PUT aside this book at this point with a sigh: "What you say may be true, but the realism of the present situation answers your realism by the simple fact that evil rules the present world situation. We are in the grip of titanic, demonic forces which seem stronger than the Kingdom of God. At any rate these forces are more politically wise and know how to seize power and retain it. They rule."

It is true that they do rule, but it is also true that their rule means ruin. And that is just the point: we do not deny that evil rules; that is self-evident, but we assert that "their rule means ruin." The nature of the universe is such that the rule of evil spells ruin. That is sheer gain, for suppose the matter were the other way round and that the reign of evil had the universe behind it and that its rule meant not ruin, but reconstruction. Then we would know that evil fits in with the nature of things, and that the universe at its heart approves of evil and is back of it. Then might our hearts die within us at this fatal discovery. But our discovery is the very opposite of that—our discovery is that evil is self-frustrating, the nature of things is against it and evil can only exist as it is surrounded by sufficient good to make it possible for it to exist. If it were not for the surrounding good, evil would break itself and the situation to pieces, for it is self-destructive and situation-destructive. Good is self-conservative and situation-conservative. Like the early Christians, "It

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

holds the world together." We admit that evil still rules, but we insist that its rule means ruin, and for this reason it is dethroned at the very moment of its ruling.

Paul saw this clearly and summed it up in a telling phrase, "The dethroned Powers who rule this world" (1 Corinthians 2. 6, Moffatt). He saw that they rule, but he also saw that in their very ruling they are "dethroned"—their authority is surface and not deep-seated, they rule by the extraneous and not by the inherent, they rule over men but not within the hearts of men, their authority is gained not by inner consent but by the seizure of outer forces which, by the nature of things, are in the process of decay. They rule, but the nerve of their rule is cut.

The Eastern sage saw this when he said that evil men may seem triumphant and rule, but "they perish at the root." All the time the outer authority is in operation it is perishing at the root. Then the storm beats upon it and down it goes—it outwardly perishes for it had perished at the root. Isaiah saw this too when he said:

"So the Lord, the Lord of hosts, will send
a wasting disease on his flourishing frame,
and under his glitter a burning heat
that glows like a flame,
consuming him soul and body,
till he pines away like a man diseased."
(Isaiah 10. 16, 18, Moffatt.)

Again he puts it in those burning words:

"The earth is drooping, withering,
the world is waning, withering,
and the sky wanes with the earth;
for the earth has been polluted
by the dwellers on its face,
loose to laws and scorning statutes,
breaking the eternal Compact."
(Isaiah 24. 4, 5, Moffatt.)

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

When men were breaking the eternal Compact—the laws of the Kingdom of God written within the nature of things and within their own natures, then they were breaking themselves. These powers that rule are dethroned, for they are living on a half-truth, or on a whole lie, and the foundation gives way and lets them down.

Take the Brahmin of India—he still rules, but he is dethroned, for the ideas underlying Brahminism have decayed. There was a time when men accepted on a wide scale the idea of the inherent superiority of the Brahmin and the inherent depravity of the lower castes. But sociological investigation revealed the fact that because the Brahmin was in power he had resources to buy culture, education, and opportunity, and that the outcastes did not have the resources to buy culture, education, and opportunity, and that inherent worth had little to do with it. When this discovery was made, the nerve of the whole idea was cut and the authority of the Brahmin withered. He is dethroned and he knows it. The examination results show clearly that the human mind is one and that high castes do not necessarily get high marks, nor low castes low marks. Very often the student of low-caste origin tops the list. The child of a sweeper was the brightest boy in our school. The student who topped the list in the science examination in the Calcutta University was a Christian lad from the headhunters of Assam. The discerning among the Brahmins see the handwriting on the wall and are now turning to inherent worth and service to the underprivileged as their way out, so they still rule and are enthroned. The rest may still rule, but they are dethroned. It is true the system based upon Brahmin superiority and “holy men” piety will go on for some time by the sheer force of custom and inertia, but it is dead.

Take another who still rules but is dethroned. The “white man” has ruled in the East because of the idea that one with a white skin is inherently superior, and one with a colored skin is necessarily inferior. But this idea is doomed. The white man

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

was the inheritor of Christian morality which gave him a better basis for his moral life; he was also the inheritor of a more stimulating climate; and he discovered first the modern scientific method. Upon these three things he rose to power. But other races are taking over elements in this rise to power and are showing themselves just as clever as the white race—for instance, the Japanese. The question of the color of the skin has nothing whatever to do with it. However, the idea of ruling over colored people because of the inherent superiority of the white man still rules, but its nerve is cut. The white man is blowing to pieces his prestige on a thousand senseless battlefields. But white rule will rule on—for awhile, but it is dethroned. The basis of it is gone. What kind of a universe would this be if the color of the pigment of one's skin decided one's right to rule? This color-superiority conception is breaking itself upon the underlying law of the Kingdom that the greatest among you shall be the servant of all. It still rules in some quarters through the momentum of the past, but it is dethroned. And ought to be. If the white man cannot rule because of his inherent character and service to others, including all underprivileged of whatever race, then his rule should cease, and the sooner the better.

Two children were playing together, black and white. The black child fell and cut herself and when the white child saw the blood she exclaimed: "Why, your blood is red like mine. I thought it was black. Our blood is the same. Why shouldn't I play with you? We are equal." A little child shall lead us. And it shall lead us in the same direction that science is pointing and in the same direction our Christian faith points: "God hath made of one blood all nations."

Plutocracy is another power which rules this world, but it too is dethroned. In an acquisitive society those who accumulate money accumulate power. "Money talks"—and it talks very authoritatively in an acquisitive order. In the hold of the ship upon which I write this is a cargo of tin and rubber sold by

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

British firms to Italy, when they knew it was only a question of days or even hours when Italy would declare war against their country, and they also knew that this tin and rubber would be used against their country. But money interest overruled patriotic and every other interest. It was the way to power. A new caste system has grown up based, not on blood, but an accumulated wealth. I had dined with one of the wealthy men of the world, and the waiter brought a wrong order in the meat course to him. At the close of the lunch the waiter was at the door as we went out and very humbly said, "I am very sorry, Mr. —, that I made that mistake." I have had waiters make many mistakes with me, but none has ever stood at the door to apologize as I went out! This apology and the obsequiousness was the modern counterpart of bending and touching the feet of the Brahmin. A new caste system has been built up. Men are placed in this caste system according to their income. Note that it is "income"—what we take in. Jesus based His system of greatness on the "outgo"—he that is greatest among you shall be the servant of all. The difference is profound and far-reaching, and reveals the essential self-centered nature of our society. Power based on such foundations is essentially immoral. The revolt against this kind of power is setting in. Such authority no longer inwardly "clicks." We are being disillusioned about the worship of this golden calf which is supposed to take us out of the land of bondage. Our knees are bowing less and less, for our hearts are accepting it less and less. A simple Igoroti miner of the Philippine Islands laid bare the essential nature of this rule when he said, "I cannot understand: I am given a good wage to dig this gold out of the earth in the Philippines and someone else is given a good wage to bury it again in Kentucky." To be ruled by money bags from a vault is not a high destiny, and men are beginning to feel the essential immorality of such a rule. The Fascists may want to replace plutocracy, the power of money, with the rule of brutocracy, the power of the brute, and we must listen to their revolt against

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

plutocracy, even when we cannot accept its substitute. Money will rule on—for awhile, but it is dethroned—we may obey its rule, but we no longer inwardly accept its authority.

When we go deeper and ask why plutocracy rules in our kind of society, we are driven to the root of the matter, namely, selfish competition. The principle of *laissez faire*—unrestricted competition, is at the basis of our economic life. This principle by its very nature cannot be Christianized, and, moreover, it cannot succeed, except for a limited period in special circumstances. It cannot succeed, for it is an attempt to organize life around one instinct, the self-instinct, and it leaves the altruistic or herd instinct atrophied and under-developed. Hence our society, even in its success, is unhappy and dissatisfied, for it is trying to live against its own nature. That nature with its social or herd instinct is built for the altruistic as definitely as for the self-regarding, for the herd or social instinct is just as deeply implanted within our nature as the self-regarding. A society which tries to live against its own nature is doomed. Someone has said that "civilization will have to save its own soul finally by the way it earns and distributes its bread." We are losing our soul by the way we earn and distribute our bread. That soul cannot be saved by spasms of philanthropy which try to atone for our central way of life. Philanthropy is good, but not good enough to undo the central fundamental wrongness of our corporate life. It is like dealing with a consumptive by giving him belladonna, as the Indian *viads* do, to stop the cough, which is itself an attempt to expel the germs of tuberculosis. When the cough is stopped the germs accumulate all the more. When I speak of philanthropy, I mean public philanthropy in the shape of "relief" or doles of various kinds, as well as private philanthropy. They are the best we can do under a system of this kind, but we must fundamentally change the system. A woman principal of a school said: "I have seen the character of my children ebb and flow with the statistics of joblessness. A boy was sent to me for a last

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

chance. He had stolen twenty-five dollars. I tried to get his confidence, but to no avail. Finally I asked him if he had three wishes, what he would wish for. He replied: 'I'd wish my father and mother got along better. I'd wish somebody back home would get a job; and I wish we'd get off relief.' You cannot love a boy like that with shallow sentiment." You must love him with a love that provides a fundamental justice at the basis of life, a justice that would give equal opportunity to all to work and to rise. This can only be done under a planned society. The unplanned society of *laissez faire* has run its course. It must be replaced by a planned society. As Mannheim, the great sociologist, has said: "It is not a question now of whether we shall have a planned or an unplanned society—the question is what *kind* of a planned society we shall have." The old unplanned society still rules but it is dethroned, for in our heart of hearts we know that the future belongs to those who can most justly and wisely plan for the whole. Individualism is an attempt to plan for oneself and oneself alone, and that attempt is under the law of self-frustration.

On the other hand, Communism of the Russian brand, while it is still ruling, it too is dethroned. Why? If the attempt to build life on the self-regarding instinct results in Individualism, the attempt to build life on the other-regarding instinct results in Communism. If the attempt to build life on the self-regarding instinct is bound to fail, just as certainly the attempt to found life on the other-regarding instinct alone is also bound to fail. Each is an attempt to found life on a half-foundation and is bound to have a whole collapse. The Russian experiment provides for the fulfillment of the social instinct, but it does not provide for the fulfillment of the self-regarding instinct. It provides for socialization but not for individual freedom. The individual is crushed in the corporate machine. When I asked a group of schoolteachers in Russia what they had to criticize concerning the system, I found they were directing all their criticisms to things

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

within the system—they were not criticizing the system itself, and when I suggested that they were afraid to do so, they laughed. But in that laugh they revealed the fundamental wrong in Russian Communism: a system which you cannot criticize is a system which is not built for individual freedom. It is bound to fail when the demand for individual freedom becomes sufficiently vocal. I can believe in Socialism only when Socialism provides for a sufficient expression of individual freedom.

For the same reason the supporters of every form of Fascism are bound to fail, for they too attempt to build life upon the corporate principle and leave no room for individual freedom. They rule today on a half-truth, but they are dethroned, for tomorrow will reveal the inadequacy of the attempt.

War is still ruling in our world and never so ruinously as now. More and more sections are being dragged under its sway. But nevertheless, while it rules, it is dethroned. We know in our heart of hearts that this isn't the way. If war is right, then Christianity is wrong; and if Christianity is right then war is wrong. An ex-soldier of the World War was being tried and condemned for murder, and the judge asked if he had anything to say before sentence of death was pronounced upon him. "Yes," said the prisoner, "I have. When I murdered in the mass at my country's behest I was called a patriot and praised, but when I murder singly at my own behest I am called a murderer and am hung." Some day we shall see no essential difference between mass murder and individual murder, and we will act accordingly. That dawning realization is a tiny thing—but it is a tiny thing like the cochineal insect, which, with its tiny sting, kills the thorny giant cactus from hundreds of square miles of area in India. War will fight on and rule on, but it is dethroned, for it has lost its head. It is all so senseless. A warrior in India was so ardent that he fought on and killed many even after his head had been cut off—so the story runs, until a woman saw this headless warrior fighting furiously and called out to him that he was dead. When he

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

heard that, he forthwith fell down and died! Perhaps it is the women first of all who will discern that War has lost its head—will see the senselessness of the whole thing and will say so. Then war will die. Meantime it rules on, and under its devastating rule we see the flower of our youth perish, little children turn hungry and anaemic and full of fear, civilizations built up through centuries perish in a night of brutality, and worse than all—we see hate eat into our souls like a cancer and kill them. War rules on but it is self-frustrating. No one wins a war, whoever wins it on paper. In reality everybody has lost. By the very nature of things war is dethroned.

When we come a little closer to our inmost bosoms, we know that while Self still rules it too is dethroned. For while Self still rules we know that its rule brings discontent and a sense of self-frustration. Those who are centered upon themselves are most discontented with themselves. When Swinburne said in a moment of humanistic rapture: "Glory to man in the highest, for man is the measure of things," he expressed a mood, but only a passing mood, for, after putting man on the throne, we find it difficult to bend the knee. Nothing inwardly compels us to worship ourselves, for we know ourselves too well. But this disillusionment about man should not drive us to the opposite mood of despairing about man, with its concomitant suggestion about the "all-healing hospital of death." No, we do not believe in man as God, nor man as sod, but man as son, obeying the will of God and, in that will finding his own will—his own very self. That Self is still on the throne, but we know that it is dethroned by the very nature of things. Macmurray ends up his great book on *The Clue to History* with these words: "The will to power is self-frustrating," and in doing so he ended up, not only his book on *The Clue to History*, but in that sentence he summed up history itself—the hard, bitter experience of humanity has driven us to that conclusion—"he that saveth his life shall lose it." When someone asked Professor Kilpatrick, the great educationalist,

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

what was the deepest discovery that the study of the principles of education had shown, he promptly replied, "He that saveth his life shall lose it." If Jesus used that sentence six times—more than any other in the gospel—all history is using it more than sixty times six, for that principle is as deeply embedded in our moral universe as the force of gravity is in the physical universe. When Chesterton said that "we do not break the force of gravity, we only prove it," he might just as truly have said that self-enthronement does not break the principle Jesus enunciated—it only proves it. When the psychologist says, "All three of these overtly aggressive types of behavior react like boomerangs upon their unfortunate authors, driven as they are to these unsatisfactory goals usually to suffer in the end what was their original intention to make others suffer. The net result is thus self-destruction,"¹ just what does he mean? He means very clearly that the universe is not made for selfishness. Mutual aid is the law of life. The rule of Self is the ruin of Self. Self is still on the throne and still rules, but its very aftermath, its results in human relationships and in the Self itself, cause it to be dethroned.

We have seen that the Brahmin, the White Man, Plutocracy, Selfish Competition, Communism, Fascism, War, and the Self are still ruling, but are dethroned. The story of Herod vividly illustrates this: He and the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon had a bitter feud and "because their country was nourished by the king's country" they made overtures of peace (an instance, by the way, of the economic determinism of history) and Herod made an oration to the people, who cried out at the close that it was "the voice of a god, and not of a man." But the next verse says that because of his pride he was "eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost" (Acts 12. 20-24). He was a worm-eaten god! All the eight things we have mentioned have been looked on as gods and have been worshiped as such. We have offered before their

¹ *Man Against Himself*, Menninger, pp. 185, 186.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

altars the finest of our manhood, our most precious substance, our time, our very selves. We have worshiped individually and en masse and have cried: "These be thy gods, O Israel, that will bring thee out of the land of bondage." We have worshiped ardently and long at these shrines, and, like the priests of Baal, we have lashed and cut ourselves in the process of making these gods hear us. But it is all to no avail—these gods are worm-eaten gods. We still bow before them, but in our heart of hearts we know that the worms of a just Nemesis are eating them. They may prolong their sway over decaying realms and over increasingly disillusioned devotees, who continue to worship because they do not know where else to turn for deliverance, but the whole thing is doomed—the gods are worm-eaten and the whole thing is on the way to death. Death may be postponed by shots-in-the-arm of various expedients to keep these systems alive and ruling, but this only puts off the inevitable end.

We would weep with bitter weeping as our gods die in front of our very eyes were there no alternative. But these half-gods have to pass so that God may come. The very next verse in this account that says, "He was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost," goes on to say, "But the word of God grew and multiplied." That word "But" is the hope of humanity—it tells us that there is an alternative to this decaying, dying order. That word "But" introduces us to the undying, to the eternal and hence unshakable order—the word of God, the Kingdom of God. That "word" is written in the constitution of things, and hence that Kingdom is an unshakable Kingdom. It "grew and multiplied" because it had within it germs of life, of Eternal Life, and its touch upon men was life-giving. The old gods will die because they have the germs of death within themselves—the germs of eternal death, and their touch upon man is death-giving. During the old Scotch feasts, in the midst of the drinking, a death's head with a skull and cross-bones was brought in to remind the revelers that we are under the shadow of death. The death's head is in all our feasts

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

before these gods—we know that nobody will win their wars, everybody will lose; we know that the economics of these gods is under the law of decreasing returns; under them social relationships go from snarl to snarl until they end in insoluble knots; and, worse still, the devotee knows that his inward life, for all his worship, is getting emptier and emptier. The death's head is at the center of this Feast. And we know it.

"But the word of God grew and multiplied"! No death's head here! For death itself has been met and conquered and harnessed to the chariot of the on-riding Kingdom. When Jesus was in the grip of His enemies, He said, "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness" (Luke 22. 53). What a thing to say!—This is your hour, and the best you could do with it is to turn it into darkness. That is the terrible doom upon these gods—they have their way, and the best they can produce is midnight darkness. They have their hour of opportunity and they turn it into an hour of oppression. They are working against the nature of things, and the result is a foregone conclusion—darkness!

But note that Jesus said, "Your hour," and then added, "my day." This is "your hour," but it is "my day!" Evil men have their hour and proceed to turn it to darkness, but the "day" belongs to Christ. It did so then, and it does so now. At the end of that day He had turned hate into love, man's worst into God's best, sin into atonement for sin, the Cross into a Throne. It was His day—the centuries being witness. The Kingdom of God got over the murder of Christ—survived it, yes, used it. It survived and used the worst thing that could happen, and it can stand anything now. In this our time, no matter who has the "hours," the "day" will belong to God. Jesus looked upon the strongest military power of that day and said of it, "You know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them"—note, "accounted to rule"—or as Moffatt puts it, "the so-called rulers"—they are only accounted to rule, they do not really rule, it is all tinsel unreality. Think of saying that

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

of Caesar and his mighty empire—only accounted to rule! And yet, and yet—the centuries speaking against these hours say the same thing. Jesus was right! In the book of Revelation there were those who wore “crowns as it were”—they were not real crowns—they were only crowns “as it were.” Today there are forces that wear “crowns as it were”—their rule is not on the eternal facts and hence they rule “as it were.” Take one of the finest of these devotees who worship at the shrine of Humanism, and listen to the note of doubt that creeps into their moment of greatest triumph: “At last he (man) is old enough to bear the thought that upon himself alone depends the issue of the struggle between life and death. For he has at length thought this fatal thought, and he must bear it.” But why this “fatal thought”? And why have to “bear” it? If the thought is in accord with reality, it should set him singing, for in that case the thought would not be “fatal” but fruitful. Why this fatal doubt at the moment of the greatest triumph? I do not talk about thinking “fatal thoughts” about the triumph of the Kingdom of God, nor do I have to “bear” those thoughts. I fairly shout them! For everything within me is awakened to joy and laughter because of this discovery of reality. Is this the wishful thinking of a professional partisan of the older generation? Then listen to a member—a very modern member of the younger generation writing in the *Atlantic Monthly*: “I capitalize Law and I mean it. Suppose it were proved that the eternal absolutes do not exist. Instinctively we would say, ‘So much the worse for them.’ But now we must learn to say, ‘So much the worse for existence.’ We have learned that from the sad experience of centuries.”² Note this startling conclusion, gained, he said, “from the sad experience of centuries,” that if “the eternal absolutes”—in other words, the Kingdom of God—do not exist, then so much the worse for existence. For existence, in order to exist, must have the eternal absolutes in and

² “But I Am a Conservative! Under Thirty,” Peter Viereck, April, 1940.

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

through it to give it meaning, coherence, direction, and goal. Existence demands the existence of the Kingdom of God, for without it existence itself would fall to pieces. The mathematician Henderson once said, "Anyone who hasn't a frame of reference is not only not educated but is subhuman." This refers to the individual, but might just as well be applied to existence itself, for if existence has no frame of reference, has nothing from which it gets its authority, its meaning, its direction, and goal, then existence itself is subhuman. It is all, "The tale of an idiot, full of sound and fury, badly told and signifying nothing." It is chaos. But—and this is the point—it doesn't seem to be. This is a world of moral consequence: there is freedom to act, but not freedom to choose the result of that acting. Those results are not in our hands—they come from the very nature of the universe which seems to bring evil under the law of self-frustration, and seems at the same time to bring good under the law of self-fulfillment.

When the New Testament says that "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken," is it mere dogmatic utterance, or is it a fact of universal experience, that any movement, any institution, any nation, any individual that sets itself against Christ is, in literal fact, broken? No voice from heaven decrees its doom, but silent decay sets in. The universe without and within will not respond to anti-Christian living. The very stars in their courses fight against it and bring it to naught. We can say with complete assurance: "Oh Rock, upon which all lasting institutions and lives are built;" and, "Oh Rock, upon which all opposing institutions and lives are broken!" The New Testament again says that, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner"—the builders, the experts, rejected this stone in the building of civilization, and now it has become the head of the corner—the crown of the whole world-structure. The cornerstone gives coherence to the whole and at the same time has written on it the interpretation of the meaning of the building. Jesus is thus the interpretation of the meaning of the world-structure. In

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Him you see what it is all about. As Sherwood Eddy says: "Jesus thus becomes our relative absolute, our plumbline of measurement. He is the keystone of the arch of human experience, the interpretative center of all history." And Cadoux adds: "Yet we find the spirit of Jesus so native to our spirit that we criticize the Power behind nature from His point of view. . . . Jesus is the culmination of the whole process of evolutionary life, and the agelong struggle, with its concomitants of pain and death, was an essential preliminary to his being."³ Note that He is the interpretation of the whole process of existence and yet is "native to our spirit"—so native to our spirit that when we find Him we know that we have found life itself. We know in our heart of hearts that "He must reign"—simply "must," for all the other reigning is ruin. He is on the throne and yet He doesn't rule, for men can refuse that rule, but they cannot refuse the ruin which follows that refusal. Christ is the homeland of the soul and of society, and all other rule is alien, disruptive and disintegrating. We are made for this and for nothing else. Wells says: "Our true State, this State that is already beginning, this State to which man owes his utmost political effort, must now be this Federal World State to which human necessities point. . . . Nationalism as a God must follow the tribal gods to limbo. Our true nationalism is mankind."⁴ To which we agree as far as it goes, but "our true State" is even beyond the Federal World State, for the Federal World State must bow to the ultimate order, the Kingdom of God, or else it will, in turn, disintegrate through its own tensions and strains.

The passing of the natives of Tasmania is one of the saddest blots in human history. The general who gave the order that the natives of that land should be rounded up and killed was in church on the Sunday before he gave the order and in church the next Sunday. Christianity flanked his decisions but did not con-

³ *A New Orthodoxy of Jesus and Personality*, p. 141.

⁴ *Outline of History*, p. 235. Reprinted by permission of the author.

THE DETHRONED POWERS WHO RULE

trol them. But the natives slipped through the advancing lines of troops, and when the troops reached the other end of the island, most of the natives were back again in the native haunts they loved so well. But the decree for their rounding up and extermination had gone forth, and a Methodist local preacher, a carpenter, who had gained their confidence and respect and love, persuaded them to go to a small neighborhood island, where they could be spared extermination. They trusted him and went. But on that island they wasted away partly from nostalgia and partly from lack of resources. They would stand on the cliffs and look toward Tasmania and with tears streaming down their faces they would stretch forth their hands and cry, "My land, my land." A race with its roots torn out of its native soil died of homesickness.

The homeland of the soul is the Kingdom of God. Every dissatisfied longing, every sense of frustration, every realization that we have missed the way, every consciousness of need unfulfilled is an unconscious crying, "My land, my land." We know we are made for that "land," and have the feeling of being "prodigals in a far country" until we come back to our Father's house.

We know that we are under the alien rule of Powers for which we are not made, we stay there under protest and long for the Day of God. That day will come. These Powers may rule, but they are dethroned. The Quaker James Nayler said, in dying, regarding the Kingdom of God: "Its hope is to outlive all wrath and contention and weary out all exaltation and cruelty and whatever is of a nature contrary to itself." That hope, to weary out "whatever is of a nature contrary to itself," is no pious hope, but is based on the solid realities of the universe. John Bennett says: "There are definite limits to human evil. When it has gone far enough, it comes up against obstacles which make it necessary for men to change their way." For evil is a road with a dead end. At the end of that road it meets God and breaks itself upon the fact of God.

The astonishing statement: "He that hath the Son hath life,

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

and he that hath not the Son hath not life," is written not merely in Scripture, but in the record of human history—all history is a comment on it.

I am therefore not too disturbed when dictators walk the earth and attempt to rule it. For even in their ruling they are dethroned. Today I read a life history and an obituary notice of one of them, and if it had been written of one who stalks the earth today it could not have been more apt: "In the later period of their power, when guilt is at the full, there shall arise a king who is defiant, a master of craft . . . ; he shall make monstrous claims and prosper in his policy, destroying his powerful foes. His designs shall be directed against the sacred people, and he shall ply his intrigues successfully; he shall plot proud plans and ruin many when they are off their guard; he shall even challenge the Prince of the angel-princes, but by a stroke from no human hand shall he be shattered" (Daniel 8. 23-25, Moffatt). Note how that account goes swimmingly to success until the will to power seems to have everything within its grip—and then, and then that grip relaxes, its hand goes palsied, for "by a stroke from no human hand" he is shattered. He broke himself on God.

The powers that rule this world have their hour, but the day belongs to God. They rule, but by the very nature of things they are dethroned. "He *must* reign," for no one else can—permanently.

CHAPTER XIII

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

IF THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS REALISM—STARK REALISM—as we have found it to be, then where does all this lead us? How do we become realistic in dealing with all this realism? Obviously, much of our thinking, many of our relationships, and most of our institutions will have to be recast and reconstructed. In fact, *we* will have to be recast and reconstructed if we are to be real in holding to this realism. All our dualisms, all our compartmentalisms, all our inoperative idealisms must come down and we must become unified beings under a unified control.

A student in India was reading a paper on "The Christian Way of Life"; when about half way through he suddenly stopped, threw the paper down and said: "Why should I read this? I am not practicing it—so why should I read it?"—and he forthwith took his seat. His obvious sincerity brought up everyone to a judgment bar. Perhaps something like that will have to happen. We will have to end abruptly our sermons when our words run beyond our actions, and stop our services when unreality sets in. The silence that would follow would be more eloquent than our words and our services.

When Jesus had finished the exposition of the nature of the Kingdom of God in many parables, He turned to His disciples and said: "Have you understood these things?" and they said to Him, "Yes." How cocksure they were that they understood the most astonishing fact ever presented to the mind of man! Little did they know how small a segment of the truth they had grasped.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

To correct their cocksureness, He went on and said, "Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old" (Matthew 13. 51, 52).

A disciple to the Kingdom of Heaven! What a title to wear! A disciple sits down before the fact of the Kingdom as a little child; is prepared to give up every preconceived notion; and is willing to follow wherever, and to whatever end, the Kingdom leads him.

But we are also called to be disciples of Christ—"If any man would be my disciple." Are they one? They are. To have relationships with Christ is to have relationships with the New Order embodied in Christ. To be a disciple of the Kingdom of God is not to be a disciple of an impersonal order. That would leave religion impersonal and legalistic. To be a disciple of a Person who embodies the New Order—this leaves religion warm and personal; and of social and cosmic significance. This makes religion more significant than science; for science deals with facts—abstracted facts—while religion deals with Fact—the underlying and inlying and overlying Fact of the Kingdom of God, the ultimate reality of our universe. A discipleship of science apart from religion leaves one with a sense of an analyzed world, but not a synthesized world; for science deals with truths—not with Truth. On the other hand, the religion of the Kingdom leaves one with a sense of a synthesized world. For it deals with Truth—ultimate truth. Life has wholeness, and thought has cohesion.

No wonder Jesus said that the man who becomes a disciple to the Kingdom of God is like a "householder who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." He is creative—he brings forth things "new"—and no wonder, for as a disciple he is on the most marvelous exploration ever undertaken by man—an exploration not among isolated facts alone, but of ultimate Fact in its completeness and entirety. I verily believe that if the Christian Church should become a disciple to the Kingdom of God,

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

there would be a new burst of creative activity that would set herself and the world ablaze. It would be "new" in that it would supersede all partial concepts, since it would be more totalitarian than the Totalitarianisms of the day; more communistic than Communism and more individualistic than Individualism. It would be "new" in that it would be comprehensive enough to take in the sum total of human relationships and intimate enough to take in my poor heart and its needs. It would be "new" in that it would give an Absolute from which to work down to all relativisms, so that we could approach problems with the sure sense that we have the answer. We would not be fumbling around amid relativisms with no key to the whole. It would be "new" in that before this mighty conception, all snobberies based on blood, on race, on class, on property, would go down before its interest in a person as a person. Anybody who began with such a conception would be bound to be "new"; he could not be dull, for the very conception is new.

But the Kingdom is not only radical—it is also conservative. The disciple brings forth "things new and *old*." If the Kingdom is to come, it also is, and has been. The disciple therefore brings forth the "old," for the "old," in whatever faith or system which embodies the Kingdom to any degree, is to that extent a part of our heritage, and should be preserved and brought forth and used today. The Kingdom-of-God man is a conservative—frankly and honestly so. But he is primarily a radical, for note the order: things "new and old." First of all it is new and secondarily old. The disciple to the Kingdom leans toward the radical, because he belongs to the great Change. The Eternally New is breaking through into our decaying world to make all things new.

Now note that Jesus says, "Every scribe who is a disciple to the Kingdom of heaven shall bring forth things new." But the scribe was the copyist—he created nothing. He copied only what the past had created. Does becoming a disciple to the Kingdom turn the copyist into the creator? The echo into a voice? Yes! For

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

now we are not only alive within, we have a live conception that challenges the whole line of life—economic, social, political and personal—with God's offer and demand.

Did I say "conception"? Here I slipped back into the old way of speaking in terms of idealism; for the Kingdom is not a conception—except perhaps to me as I think about it. In reality it is not a conception: it is a *Fact*.

Now we are to become disciples to this Fact. In other words, we are to become disciplined to this Fact. The word "disciple" and the word "discipline" are from the same root. There can be no discipleship without discipline, especially if the object of our discipleship is a Fact and not an idea. You may study an idea and the whole thing may end in thought; but you must take sides with a Fact, you must come under its sway and dominance and live out your life in terms of it, especially if that Fact be an absolute Order embodied in an absolute Person.

The future of the world is in the hands of disciplined people. "It is a well-established fact that discipline gives strength to men . . . the concept of sacrifice, of its absolute social necessity, must be introduced into the mind of modern man." The Fascists and the Nazis and the Communists have taught us that, for they represent discipline. Many undisciplined nations have fallen before them. For good or ill, discipline is a power. However, the statement that the future of the world is in the hands of disciplined people needs correction, for it is possible to be disciplined to a wrong or inadequate conception. That discipline in the beginning would be strength by the very fact of its being discipline, yet in the end, if the discipline be to the wrong or inadequate thing, it will let you down, for the universe won't back it. The statement must then be: The future of the world is in the hands of disciplined people who are disciplined to Reality. That we have in the Kingdom of God Reality itself, I have no doubt whatever. If this that we find in Christ is not Reality, then there is none.

The question is not, then, with the object of our discipline.

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

We have the one adequate Fact for which a divided and confused world is waiting. The question is with our discipline. The tragedy is that discipline is the one thing we are lacking in, especially in the Protestant form of Christianity. The Roman Catholics are much more disciplined; but the object of their discipline—namely, an infallible Church represented by an infallible Pope—is the weak point in the discipline; for the world cannot accept an infallible Church and an infallible Pope. We cannot go back to medievalism; but even so, their discipline has carried them a long way. Protestantism is pathetically lacking in discipline, that is, in a capacity to act together and to act together for vital ends. The reason for this is not hard to find. In the Reformation we threw over the idea that one can be saved by penances, disciplines, work. Salvation was by grace through faith. A great discovery, and we must hold to it. Salvation is by grace through faith in Christ, with nothing between. BUT—and this is the tragedy—in this discovery we threw away the necessity of discipline. We threw out the baby with the bath! We cannot be saved by discipline, but our salvation cannot be effective unless disciplined.

There is really no clash between grace and discipline. Paul puts them together in these words: "The grace of God has appeared to save all men, and it schools us to renounce irreligion and worldly passions and to live a life of self-mastery, of integrity, and of piety in this present world" (Titus 2. 12, Moffatt). "The grace of God schools us"—the grace of God which is supposed to take away the necessity for discipline, actually produces that discipline. It schools us; and it schools us to do two things: "to renounce," and "to live a life"; to let go and to take on; to renounce and to realize. And the thing we realize first of all is self-mastery. A disciplined life emerges out of the grace of God.

If salvation is individual escape from the present evil world, and getting to heaven, then only a personal discipline is necessary; but if salvation means the saving of society as well as the individual, then obviously this cannot be effected except by dis-

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

ciplined persons working through disciplined group action. The end is group action; but this group action cannot be effective except through disciplined persons.

The first discipline, then, is to discipline oneself. When we speak of discipline, we usually think of discipline imposed from without by authority; but the kind of discipline I am speaking of is a chosen discipline—a discipline from within. The whole evolution of human morals is to get the policeman off the street corner and put him into your heart. The discipline from without is replaced by discipline from within. We then do things not because we are compelled from without, but impelled from within.

In order to be disciplined persons we must discipline ourselves regarding the four great enemies of the human personality: resentments, fear, self-centeredness, and a sense of guilt. In regard to these four things there must be no evasions, no excuses, no rationalizations, no laying blame on others. A psychologist has said: "To be frank and honest in all relations, but especially in relation to oneself, is the first law of mental hygiene." It is also the first law of the Kingdom. Cast out all resentments by a confession of all harbored resentments and by asking forgiveness of those against whom we have held the resentments, and by giving forgiveness to those who have wronged us. This should be done at once before the resentments get set within the nature as attitude and action. Discipline yourself "not to let the sun go down upon your wrath." Balance up the books every day and leave no outstanding accounts. The resentful self will excuse and twist and plead for pity, and try to wriggle out of the humiliation that comes through confession and forgiveness. Be relentless; for in dealing drastically with initial resentments, you lay the foundation for keeping away from future resentments; for if the self knows that resentments are to be invariably and immediately followed by confession and forgiveness, then the self will learn the lesson and will not allow itself to be hurt and angered. Discipline yourself to be superior to all anger and grudges and enmity. Keep

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

saying to yourself, in the words of Luther: "My soul is too glad and too great to be the enemy of any man."

Then discipline yourself against all anxiety and fear. Keep reminding yourself that there is nothing to be afraid of except fear. Fear is the enemy—not the thing of which we are afraid, for most of our fears are never realized. They never come. Those that do come can be used in the purposes for which we live. We cannot only bear them—we can use them, can make them contribute. If you feel that is the statement of one who has suffered little, then listen to Gopal Menon, a nationalist leader in India who was fourteen years in jail because of his national convictions: "As I look back upon what I have gone through, I am convinced that the thesis of your book, *Christ and Human Suffering*, is absolutely true. I believe that everything in life, except madness, can be used in your purposes." He came out a transformed man. Imprisonment had freed him! "Everything turns to good, when we turn ourselves and it over to God." If your sense of inferiority makes you afraid, keep saying to yourself, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Say it the last thing at night just before dropping off to sleep, and say it upon awakening, and then keep repeating it to yourself throughout the day until it becomes a part of your subconscious mind. The fact is that a sense of inferiority may be a bad thing or a good thing. It may paralyze you or it may spur you on to make up that which you feel you lack. All my life I have had to struggle with a sense of inferiority. When I first went out to India, on board ship I stayed in my cabin, lest in walking on the deck people should say something about me. In the midst of highly educated people I often feel uneducated, but instead of paralyzing me, it has spurred me on to make up what I have lacked. It has compelled me not to waste time. All my successes have been a surprise to me; but my very lack has driven me to draw heavily on the resources of Christ. What I lacked in endowment and training I would make up by being a channel of divine power. I can sympathize with

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

Colonel Todd when he said that all the time he was breathlessly painting the face of "The Nazarene"—one of the great pictures of the world—the Inner Voice kept saying, "O ye of little faith. Wherefore didst thou doubt?" He painted with an urge of faith within him even amid his doubt. You too can live by an aggressive faith that will beat down all fear and inferiorities and make you full of self-mastery and situation-mastery. There is nothing to fear except fear. You can lay hold on the worst and make it into the best. A friend tells me of a friend of his who, in a motor accident, was blinded. At first he thought of suicide, but he decided to use the affliction of blindness. The doctor told him that he could save just a little of one eye, but the other eye would have to be taken out and a glass eye put in. The patient thought a moment and then said: "All right, doctor, I consent, but if you do have to put in a glass eye please put a twinkle in it." That is the spirit. Catch that discipline.

Then discipline yourself against self-centeredness. The speaker who thinks about himself while he is speaking is lost. If his tones and his gestures and the impression he is making get his attention, then he is a dud. Only as he loses himself in his message and in the cause he is advocating, does he find himself come back to himself in moral mastery. In the same way, if you live in a state of self-reference, you will find yourself becoming disintegrated and small. Be so disciplined to the Kingdom that nothing matters except the Kingdom. What happens to you and me is of little or no account. What happens to the Kingdom is everything. You will then grow with the greatness of your purposes. John Wesley was carried bleeding into a vicarage after being stoned by a mob for preaching his gospel. The vicar, with three or four livings, was well to do and had a bevy of servants, one of whom, while walking through the room, dropped a piece of coal, at which the vicar was upset and scolded him roundly, after which he turned to Wesley with a sigh and said: "You see, Mr. Wesley, we too have our crosses." Our crosses! The vicar was upset by

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

the falling of a piece of coal on the floor, and Wesley was not upset by the falling of stones on his head! The reason was that one was self-centered and the other was Kingdom-centered. Wesley wiped off his forehead and went his way—a happy warrior who was indifferent to personal wounds—if only the Cause go on! Be disciplined beyond yourself to the Cause. Then you will not feel petty hurts and slights. You will feel only for the Cause.

Discipline yourself away from inner guilt. Discipline your mind against all impure thinking, all dallying with impure suggestions, all playing with dishonesties and lies. If the suggestion is made that, "No one will ever know," reply without hesitation, "Yes, but *I* will know, and I refuse to wear within my bosom a leaden lump of guilt." Be decisive. "Ah," you say, "but there is already a leaden lump of guilt within me. How can I get rid of that? I do not start at scratch. I am handicapped by my past." We all are—until we find release through the forgiving grace of God. If forgiveness sounds too good to be true, then remember that forgiveness is not merely written in the pages of Scripture—it is written within you—in the very constitution of your physical make-up. Break a bone—does Nature say, "Once broken, always broken—there is no forgiveness—no restoration"? On the contrary, as soon as the bone is broken, Nature rushes with the healing materials to restore and forgive. Healing sets in at once. Forgiveness and restoration are written in your blood stream. It is therefore no strange message when from the pages of Scripture there comes a voice: "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee." Receive that forgiveness and rejoice in it. Then keep yourself disciplined against any doubtful things. If they cannot give the password, "I contribute to the Kingdom," refuse them entrance.

Be disciplined in regard to the four great enemies of the personality, but in addition, discipline your body and make it the finest instrument of the Kingdom of God you can make it. Talk to your body. Take it into your confidence. Tell it that you expect it to bear its load in the work of the Kingdom and not to let

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

you down or to work at cross-purposes. It is astonishing how the body will respond. One of the members of our Ashram, when his body gets out of sorts, talks to it thus: "See here, I'm cutting off supplies till you stop acting up." He stops eating! The body usually quickly straightens up by this drastic treatment. Keep a disciplined body. This will mean that your sex life will contribute to your Kingdom fitness and not clog it. Discipline your sex attitudes and habits with this question: "Do you contribute? If not, out you go." And be relentless. "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off"—if any relationship is as dear to you as that right arm and yet is an offense to you, cut it out.

It is not enough to be self-disciplined—you must be God-disciplined. In order to be God-disciplined you must discipline yourself to keep faithfully your quiet-time tryst with God. More people fail at this place than at any other. I find I am better or worse as I pray more or less. This, then, being a fact, keep the quiet time, and in it let God discipline you in two ways: First, through the written Word of God. Wash your thinking in it every day before you go out. Your brain cells will be cleaner for this daily bath. A prominent manufacturer writes me as follows: "Some time ago I had a nervous breakdown which was largely based on fear. . . . I was very much impressed by a statement made by the doctor that almost all human ailments, including organic troubles, could be brought about by improper mental attitudes. . . . One afternoon while I was there I was so depressed that I was afraid I was going to die, and then I was afraid I was not going to die. Finally it occurred to me that I might get some comfort from the Psalms, and I think I read every one of the Psalms that afternoon. After I finished this reading I got up with a feeling of elation and that I was completely cured. And I was." Note how he let the Psalms speak to his depression. Second, after meditating on the Word, still your soul and your lips and let God speak to you directly and immediately in the inner depths. He will guide you through the written Word, through

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

the counsel of good people, through opening providences, through closed doors, and through the direct Voice in your heart. That direct Voice will in time be distinguished intuitively from the voice of your own desires, but in any case test that Voice by the other methods of guidance and see if it rings true with them. Then follow it with abandon—that Voice will never let you down. In the words of a Negro member of our Ashram:

“Read yourself full,
Think yourself clear,
Pray yourself hot,
Let yourself go.”

In order to be disciplined as an individual there must be a group discipline. No one can discipline himself in isolation; it must be done through a group. Whether we choose our group or not, our lives will be molded by group life. John Dewey says: “Anything which may be called mind or intelligence is not an original possession but is a consequence of a manifestation of instincts under the conditions supplied by associated life in the family, the school, the market place, and the forum.”¹ If we are made by our group, willy-nilly, whether we choose it or not, then it is of the highest importance that we choose our groups. Discipline yourself in a small group. The future of the world will probably be molded by small groups thinking and acting beyond the rest. The mass of the people do not think—they echo. They do not act, they react. As someone has said: “Five per cent of the people think, ten per cent think they think, and the rest would rather die than think.” The future of the world is in the hands of that five per cent, provided that five per cent organize themselves into group thinking and group action.

It doesn't take many people to determine the life of the coun-

¹ “The Need for Social Psychology,” *Psychological Review* (1917), pp. 270, 271.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

try—a small determined minority can do it. Less than a hundred people produced the Renaissance in Europe; and less than a hundred people produced the Protestant Reformation. It was a mere handful of people who produced the Russian Revolution. It was said in Paris in 1914 that it would be difficult to find two Russian Communists, and “if you found four, it would be a miracle.” But in less than five years they swept Russia. It was only a small but determined minority that made Germany Nazi and Italy Fascist. It is said that a small group of young men trained under the guidance of Doctor Welsh founded the Johns Hopkins Medical School and initiated the astonishing progress of pathology, surgery and hygiene in the United States. Alexis Carrel advocates in his masterly book, *Man, the Unknown*, that small groups of trained men be formed who shall live simply, even ascetically, but who should think out and plan out the directions humanity should take. He feels that small groups can do it. Individuals cannot. It is interesting that he, working along the pathways of science, has come out at the same place where we have come out in India, namely, the necessity of small groups, such as Ashrams, where a few disciplined people, living simply, will come to group decisions and group action and blaze new trails in the jungle of confusion.

Christianity began as a group movement. Jesus called twelve men around Him. If He taught individuals, He did not teach them an individualistic religion. “There is no such thing as solitary religion in the New Testament,” says Moffatt, and he is right. “Fear not, little flock, it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.” The Kingdom was to be given to a little flock and not merely to individuals. The Kingdom would come through group action. If these Kingdom-of-God groups are to be effective, they must be unreservedly committed to Christ and unbreakably committed to each other. They must enter a conspiracy of love to keep each other up to the highest. Moreover, these groups must discipline themselves away from the trivial and

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

marginal to the central and fundamental. They must deal with diseases and not with symptoms. They must demand that the church and society deal with the underprivileged not on the basis of charity but justice. We are willing to be charitable, but we are not willing to be just. Charity leaves the fundamental relationship unchanged between the giver and the recipient, but justice fundamentally changes this basis. In South Africa thirty-seven restrictive bills were put through which took away the last vestige of franchise which the native African had. The leader of this movement said, in a public address, "Now that we have clipped the native's wings, we must be kind to him and we must be an example to the rest of the world as to how to treat the native." Willing to be kind, but not willing to be just! Yet kindness without justice is an insult. When Sir Thomas Lipton gave ten thousand pounds for the orphans and widows of sailors, the remark of a sailor was to the point: "We are grateful for the gift, but if they would pay more attention to the conditions under which sailors live and work, there would be fewer widows and orphans to support." A disciplined group would not despise charity, nor would they be blind to the fact that charity may be eyewash and a substitute for justice. A small disciplined group would penetrate through the veneer of things and show how utterly incompatible with the Kingdom of God this present order is; for it is based on selfish competition where the weakest go to the wall, whereas the Kingdom of God is based on mutual aid: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Nor would the remedy be to change a few men within the order and hope that they will make the order other than what it basically is. As someone has said, "A flock of archangels administering this order could not make it other than it is." The order has to be changed from a competitive one to a co-operative one, for the future of the world is in the hands of those who co-operate on the widest scale for the highest ends. It has been said, "The men of science have been saying all along that the secret of survival is

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

mutual aid and the chief cause of extinction is failure to co-operate." But in this co-operation, this disciplined group would show a new motive: "Be subject one to another out of reverence for Christ." "Be subject to one another"—that is pure Democracy. "Out of reverence to Christ"—that is pure Autocracy. The two principles of Democracy and Autocracy are put together in a living blend and both are fulfilled. Moreover, a lasting foundation for co-operation is laid; for if you are subject to one another out of reverence for Christ, and not merely out of reverence for personality, as many humanists advocate, you will not get tired and lose your faith in man as those humanists often do. You have to believe in, and love something higher than man in order to believe in, and to keep on loving man. A disciplined group would show this and illustrate it in their own corporate lives.

But why be tempted to anticipate group conclusions? However, these conclusions are not just personal anticipations, but the considered conclusions to which a group of us have come through the years as we have tried to discipline ourselves to the Kingdom.

The insistence upon the necessity of small disciplined groups of, say, not more than thirty (for beyond thirty it has been found that the group is usually too large to be a working unit), does not mean that I would not also insist upon the necessity of the larger group, the Church. This smaller group should be the soul of the larger group, inspiring it and leading it to Kingdom ends. That larger group, the Church, is rooted in human necessities. We are by nature social as well as individual, and there must be a society through which we can express the social side of our faith. If the Christian Church were wiped out tomorrow, you would have to have something like it to put in its place as representing "the Beloved Community." For, with all its faults, the Church is the best serving institution in the world. It has many critics, but no rivals in the work of human redemption. Moreover, it is a wonderful thing to feel that we belong to the one organization which stretches across family, class, race, and national lines and

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

brings us into a common brotherhood apart from these barriers. It is the only such organization now holding together humanity. A Negro friend of mine was in a German train, and telling about it said, "Since I had always been trained from childhood to respect and honor women I got up and gave a German woman my seat, and stood up for three hours. When the lady was about to go she tried to thank me, but I couldn't understand her German and she couldn't my English, so she took a piece of paper and wrote on it, 'Isaiah 58. 11'"—and through that passage a Negro and a German were brought together in fellowship by a Jew—and this in the land of the Nazi! The Christian Church contains the possibility of a world brotherhood. While I say that, I say it with a catch in my throat, lest the very saying of it bring complacency and smugness; for if there were ever an hour when smugness and complacency are out of order, this is that hour. The Church is being attacked all down the line and in some places is going down like a row of ninepins; and very often, where it isn't going down, it is being driven into irrelevancies through compromise.

If the Church will save itself and the world, it must do at least three things: First, it must cease being an end in itself. It must declare itself before the world and organize itself on the basis that it is a means to the end of the Kingdom of God. It must be disciplined by the Kingdom and act and live for Kingdom ends. This would be a reversal of much of our Church mentality and would lift the Church life out of many irrelevant trivialities. I say trivialities, and I mean it. When the coast-to-coast telephone was put through in South America, the first words that went across from coast to coast were, "Have you any beer?" All that labor and all that apparatus to bear that message! This has its counterpart in Church life when the apparatus of expensive church buildings and well-paid clergy is used Sunday by Sunday to express pious platitudes that set no one on fire and set no one marching for the Cause. Very often it is a "mild-mannered clergyman

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

speaking to a mild-mannered people to make them more mild-mannered."

Only as the Church is Kingdom-centered and not self-centered is it vital. If the Church is the Body of Christ, the Kingdom is the Soul of Christ, and without that soul, the body becomes soulless and dies. The Church without a Kingdom passion coursing through its blood is a dead Church. The Church exists to demonstrate within itself the meaning of the Kingdom of God, and to challenge the world with the meaning of that Kingdom, and when it ceases to do so it has ceased to have the right to exist. In that case Christ will have to say as He said once: "The Kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a people who shall bring forth the fruits thereof."

Second, the Church must discipline itself to think of itself as a whole and not as separate isolated units. Our fragmented mentality has made us incapable of acting as a whole. This fragmented mentality was vividly demonstrated in South Africa when a mining company, moving to a new compound, undertook to put up new churches for the different denominations represented among the miners. They put up seventeen churches, all exactly the same pattern, on the same street, eight on one side of the street and nine on the other, and dedicated them all at once. After the dedication the congregations broke up into their seventeen varieties. That brood of seventeen churches is the offspring of our Western denominationalism with its separatist mentality. That must cease. As someone has said, "If the Church doesn't unite and unite soon, there will soon be no Church to unite." But I see no hope of unity on any basis except that of a Federal Union. Since Federal Union for churches was proposed it has had powerful though unconscious backing, from the proposal that Streit gives in *Union Now*, where he proposes Federal Union of the nations as the basis for a united world. As the Thirteen Colonies were driven into Federal Union as the way out—a way that has proved remarkably successful, so the

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

nations are being driven in the same direction, and as Churches we will have to take the same way. Any other path seems hopeless. This way is open and it is open to "union now." And it could be done quickly, provided we give up the will to absorb others and have the will to unite with others. The necessity for union is so crying that it has become desperate.

Third, the Church must discipline itself to use its own weapons, not those of the world. In face of the inundation of the world by the military mentality and method there is a desperate need for the Church to do something more than protest—it must discipline itself for united action. It has the weapons in its hands and those weapons fit in with the underlying spirit of our gospel. What can the Church do? It can show the way out of this military frenzy by a disciplined mass refusal to co-operate. It can practice nonviolent nonco-operation. A mass passive resistance could stem this tide toward universal war with its concomitant of universal destruction. This disciplined mass refusal would be met by repression and persecution. So be it! We must regain the capacity of the early Church to suffer for our convictions. Jails must lose their terror and we must get used to the sight of our own blood. This would drive us back to the weapon of the Cross. We would not hate, we would not retaliate, but we would not bend. *Satyagraha*, or truth-force, would become for us *Kristagraha*—Christ-force. We would match against the weapons of outer force weapons of inner spirit. The Church must fling away its acquired military arms and take its own weapons—the weapons of overcoming evil with good, hate by love and the world by a Cross. Would such a people be defenseless? Listen to the words of Emerson: "If you had a nation of men who have risen to that height of moral cultivation that will not declare war, or carry arms, for they have not so much madness left in their brains, you have a nation of lovers and benefactors, of true, great and noble men. Let me know more of that nation. I shall not find them defenseless with idle hands swinging at their sides. I shall

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

find them men full of love of honor and truth; men of an immense industry; men whose influence is felt to the ends of the earth; men whose very look and voice carry the sentence of honor and shame, and all forces yield to their energy and persuasion. When you see the doctrine of peace embraced by a nation, you may be assured it will not be one that invites injury, but one, on the contrary, which has a friend in the heart of every man, even of the violent and the base; one against which no weapon can prosper; one which is looked upon as the asylum of the human race and has the tears and blessings of humanity."

The nonviolent revolution which Christianity stands for "is the only kind of victory that the world knows in which everybody is victorious—a revolution where all are victorious and there are no victims to mourn."

This method of nonviolent nonco-operation with evil is the method Jesus illustrated and taught. "Every plant which my Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone." Note the method of rooting them up: let them alone. Refuse them co-operation. Suppose it fails through lack of widespread backing, still you have won as far as you are concerned. In that case the Church has saved its own soul even if it hasn't saved the world. But the world will be so disillusioned by the mess it is creating through war that it will probably turn with a sigh of relief to any open door out of the mess. The Church must fling open that door, and it must do it now. Else when we awake to the meaning of this orgy of military frenzy and return to our senses, the Church will be despised for merely taking on protective resemblance to its surroundings, and echoing the slogans of the frenzied hour.

The Church has in the method of mass passive refusal to co-operate, a universal method by which it can face entrenched evil anywhere. It is the moral equivalent of war. If the Church should suffer through nonviolent warfare, it could then wear its scars as proudly as any soldier. For God wears His scars in His

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

fight with evil. A little girl was told the meaning of the silver and gold stars in the windows of houses during and after the last war—the silver star for the family which had a son in the war and a gold star for those who had lost a son. That night the stars were out and amid the silvery stars in the sky was a golden star, so the little girl asked her father, "God seems to have a gold star in the heavens, did He lose His son in the war?" Yes, little girl, He did, and nothing makes God so wonderful as just that. And nothing makes the Church so respectable in its own eyes and in the eyes of others as the fact that it wears the scars of its non-violent battle with evil.

Let it be clear that we advocate not permanent breaking with society, but a breaking on a lower level in order to call attention to an evil, that we might meet on a higher level when that evil is corrected. The end is not a break, but a reconciliation on a higher level.

But does the Cross fit in with the thesis of this book—the Kingdom of heaven within you? Is the Cross also within us? Yes, it is within our very blood stream. Let an infection come upon the arm—does Nature say, "There is nothing can be done—once infected always infected"? On the contrary, the healing, forgiving, atoning processes set in at once. I say "atoning," and I mean it, for the white corpuscles rush with reckless sacrifice and die by the millions, that the infection may be repelled and the rest of the body saved. The pus that comes off is the corpses of the white corpuscles which have sacrificed their lives for us. So the Atonement was not merely on a Hill two thousand years ago—it is in your very blood—therefore inescapable.

If the Christian Church refuses the Cross in mass action against entrenched evil, then it denies not only the blood of Christ, but denies its own blood too. And when it does, red blood will cease to flow within its veins and mere water will flow there instead. The Church will be an anaemic, bloodless creature. Then it will be like Joseph of Arimathaea, "who was a disciple of Jesus, but

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

secretly for fear of the Jews," and who "was looking for the Kingdom of God"—a secret disciple suppressing his inmost loyalties and merely "looking for the Kingdom of God"—"looking for it," but not willing to suffer for the Kingdom—a spectator and not a participant. Someone asked a timid little boy if he had joined in the play with the other boys and he replied, "No, but I smiled twice." Two smiles from the side lines instead of active participation! The Church will be merely an onlooker with an occasional smile for the participants if it doesn't choose to get in with mass action. The Church will be much like Joseph—he "was looking for the Kingdom of God," and found only a dead Christ. The best he could do was to provide a tomb. And the best the Church will be able to do will be to provide itself as a tomb for a dead Christ. Then it will be where we are now on board this ship—in the Doldrums. The Doldrums is the space between the Trade Winds of the Southeast and the Trade Winds of the Northeast, an empty space near the equator in the Atlantic, where no winds blow and the air is heavy with moisture. Sailing ships are often becalmed here. If the Church does not act with courage, it will be just there—in the Doldrums, with no winds of God blowing across its soul, becalmed and going nowhere.

It must take sides and use its own means to its own ends. I asked a man in a hospital if he were a member of the staff or a patient. He replied, with a self-conscious smile, that he was a patient. Everyone in that hospital belonged either to the disease or to the cure. In the larger situation it is the same—the Church belongs to the cure of the disease of war by its positive disciplined mass-refusal to countenance or to take part in it, or it goes over to the other side and belongs to the disease of war itself.

We have the numbers—the largest single unit of the world, around a single allegiance. Why should we go on making our chief objective the recruiting of numbers? Why keep on recruiting when we do not use the recruits we now have? The end in view should be the battle, and we have more than enough for that,

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

provided we are disciplined. We must now be disciplined—disciplined in our personal lives, disciplined in group life and action, disciplined to think and act in terms of the whole, disciplined for mass-action.

And let us keep the burning thought that we are disciplined to the Kingdom of God—the Absolute Order and the Final Way of Life. All other objectives must fail—this cannot. This is an unshakable Kingdom, so amid all the shaking of kingdoms to the dust we will stand unshaken too. We have the one solid reality in a world of make-believe. We can therefore act with abandon, knowing that the sum total of reality is at our back.

“How do we begin?” asked the saintly Bishop Pakhen-Walsh at the close of an address on the Kingdom of God, to which I replied: “We must go out and act in our personal and corporate lives as though the Kingdom were already here. And then as far as we are concerned it will be.” The answer was so satisfactory, he told me later, that he went out and founded his Ashram, a Kingdom-of-God Ashram, where he and his colleagues live in corporate demonstration of the new Order, however small and incomplete it may be. It is a “cell” of the Kingdom.

Each of us must go out and in our own lives and sphere of influence act as though the Kingdom were already here. We will then live by “anticipated attainment,” by “realized apocalyptic.” “The powers of the age to come” will be operative within this age. As far as we are concerned the Kingdom has come.

The prayer, “May Thy Kingdom come,” is literally, “Let Thy Kingdom come”—we consent to its coming; we allow it to work in and through our surrendered lives, we put ourselves at the disposal of the Kingdom, we are committed soul and body. Let Thy Kingdom come! That Kingdom is ready to burst into our individual and collective lives with cleansing and unifying dynamic. It is at our doors. It is within us. It awaits our consent—the taking down of our barriers.

.

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

We have now come to the end of our quest of the Kingdom as realism. I trust that this question leaves us where the attendance upon a young people's conference left a Negro girl. When she returned home her family saw by her face that something had happened, and when they asked her what it meant, she replied, "I've got a star in my heart." I trust that this quest leaves us with just that—a star in the heart. If so, then while men grope "amid the encircling gloom" we shall not grope—we have our star in the heart. As men fear for the things that are about to come upon the earth, we shall not fear—the old is tumbling that the new may come: we have our star in the heart. We bet our lives on this Kingdom, and it will not let us down. If this isn't reality, then there is none and we are done for. I have a great deal of sympathy with the prayer of the little girl in a missionary family who, at the family prayers at night, committed each one in the family to the care of God and then ended: "And, O God, do take care of yourself, for if anything should happen to you, we'd be in the soup." Yes, little daughter, you're right—we would be! But God is taking care of Himself, and of His Kingdom, for He has built that Kingdom from the foundation of the world; has built it into the very structure of our physical, mental and spiritual constitutions; has built it into the economic, social, and political relationships of men; has built it into the very structure of life, so that life cannot be lived in any other way. It will not work in any other way.

This is the "new naturalism"—a naturalism that brings life from its compartmentalisms into unity—the unity of the material and the spiritual, the secular and the sacred, the personal and the social—the unity of all mankind under a single government—with God as Father and men as brothers. Deepest of all it brings a man into unity with himself, delivering him from all resentments, all fears and anxieties, all self-centeredness and all guilts and complexes and inferiorities.

I have heard many profound things spoken in my Round-Table

DISCIPLINED TO THE KINGDOM

Conferences through the years, but one of the profoundest things I have heard was the statement of a Church of England clergyman: "I am trying to live in a natural way, that is, in the Christian way." In that simple sentence is a deep profundity, for if that be true, then all attempts to live in any other way are bound to break down—you cannot live against yourself and get away with it.

In "taking the yoke of the Kingdom," as the Hebrews called it, we find this yoke is easy and its burden is light. For His yoke is our yearning, His burden is our bent. We are made for it, as the veins are made for blood, and the lungs are made for air. When we find the Kingdom, we find ourselves. We are then free and spontaneous. As was said of one man: "he comported himself in duty as on a holiday," so it will be said of us. We can now "let nature caper"—our true nature. We know what Augustine meant when he said, "Love God and do as you like." And we also know the meaning of the Prayer-Book phrase, "whose service is perfect freedom." Life is no longer artificial, it is artesian. It meets all life with a song and a cheer—even when life is difficult and even cruel. When they cut the tendons of the skillful hands of a Jewish Christian surgeon in Germany so that he could no longer operate, he went out to Africa as a missionary doctor and heals the wounds of that needy land. That is the spirit of those that take the yoke of the Kingdom—the yoke is easy, no matter what happens.

When the *Titanic* was going down and people were rushing for the lifeboats, word was passed down the line to the officers in the crisis, "Be British!" It was a great watchword, for it upheld the great traditions of a seafaring people built up through centuries. But on board was the man under whom I was converted, the Rev. Robert Bateman, and as they stood on the sinking ship awaiting death, having put the women and children in the lifeboats, he struck up a hymn in his deep, triumphant voice. And as the ship went down they sang. What he said to the people

IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD REALISM?

with fearful hearts and blanched faces was, "Be Christian!" That is the way the Christian meets disaster. But we must not only meet disaster with that watchword upon our lips—we must meet the whole task of reconstruction, individual and social, the whole task of making a new world with that watchword upon our lips and in our hearts: "Be Christian!" For all life, using the method of trial and error, is pushing us to that conclusion. Every other road is a road with a dead end. For we now see that if there is to be any content in that word "BE," except blank despair and futility, then we must "Be Christian." But we also see that we can only "Be Christian" if in that word "Christian" is the content which Jesus put into it, namely, the Kingdom of God, for the Kingdom of God is the only Realism.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



124 978

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY